

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

CHRISTIANITY to-day finds itself face to face with a widespread and profound moral chaos which constitutes, perhaps, its biggest problem. Men are not so much asking questions about creeds and authorities, but in reference to fundamental moral issues they are simply asking, 'Why shouldn't I?' The Church must be prepared to answer this question patiently and convincingly, and in order to do so it must be able to present to modern men a satisfying and coherent world-view. 'For the question: What is the right kind of conduct? plainly presupposes another: How can we interpret the universe and Man's place and destiny within it?'

To this question the Rev. F. R. BARRY, M.A., D.S.O., addresses himself in an extremely able and suggestive book, *The Relevance of Christianity* (Nisbet; 10s. 6d. net), which is described as 'an approach to Christian Ethics,' but which is in reality a most searching examination of the foundations upon which all Christian ethic is built.

Christianity has a world-view peculiarly its own, and by it the Church stands or falls. For 'if the finality of the Christian ideal and the Christian rule of conduct cannot be maintained, no temporary success of the apologist in rebutting this or that ill-considered scientific or historical criticism can alter the fact that the Christian faith as a religion is under sentence of death.' Many of the loftiest moral teachers of the nineteenth century were serenely assured that Christian ethics would survive

though severed from the foundation of Christian doctrine. The idea that the validity of Christian ethics might be challenged seems hardly to have occurred to them. Their expectations have been rudely shattered. There is not a single stone in the whole edifice of Christian ethics which is not being overturned, and it becomes increasingly clear that the Christian way of life can only be maintained upon the basis of Christian faith. 'What is really needed if the Christian ethic is to be vindicated to the hearts and minds of this generation, is to re-enthroned the Christian faith in God in the only position which it can rightly occupy—at the centre of men's thinking and willing, and their interpretation of life.' 'The real question about Christian ethics is therefore to show how the Christian world-view, centred upon faith in a living God and accordingly supernatural in its emphasis, can offer itself as the interpretation of our rich and manifold experience in an ever-widening and bewildering Universe.'

The conditions of modern life tend to set aside as irrelevant, and to dissolve as unreal, the Christian world-view. Modern life has become so complex, society has been unified and mechanized on so vast a scale that the simple prescriptions of Christian ethic appear totally inadequate. 'The task which confronts Christianity is to lift this world, so rich, yet so penurious, on to loftier planes of possibility by setting man's life against its eternal background and redeeming all its this-world concerns by the cleansing presence of the super-

natural.' To achieve this we must first have an adequate conception of what religion is and of its real place as a directing and redemptive force in the midst of contemporary society. Is it true to say that everything in life is religious, or is religion a thing apart, and if so, what is its relation to life? These questions must be answered if Christianity is again to become an effective force in the world's affairs.

The impression is widely prevalent that religion is a thing apart, and the Christian life has accordingly been interpreted almost wholly in purely 'religious' terms, and not as including the cultural life of society. 'Many of the finest minds have come to believe themselves confronted with an unbelievably tragic choice. On the one side there is the Christian religion, to the claims of which they are keenly sensitive, withdrawn, as it seems, from the world, and aloof from its opportunities and enterprises. On the other side are the movement and colour, the rich gifts and exacting demands of twentieth-century civilization. The two present themselves as alternatives, and men believe that they must decide between them. How can we deliver the next generation from this disastrous dilemma?'

The solution lies in a certain 'razor edge position,' by which a due balance is maintained between the religious and the secular. Religion must enter into the whole of life. Religious experience is not to be understood as some specialized and ecstatic state. It cannot, in fact, mean anything else than 'the life-experience of a religious man, his total response to his environment as directed and sustained by his religion.' Yet religion *is* different, is in its essence otherworldly. It has the Cross at its centre, and its teaching is that life can be won only by losing it. 'The problem before us therefore is this: How, without losing its true otherworldliness, *i.e.* without ceasing to be a religion, can Christianity establish itself creatively, freely, and spontaneously at the heart of the actual life of the twentieth century?'

This is precisely what we see being done in the New Testament, 'an otherworldly religion building

a new society round itself, cleansing and redeeming its values.' And how was this accomplished? Not by elaborating a social gospel, but by proclaiming the vision of God in Christ. 'The otherworldliness of the early Church is a massive concentration on the one thing the world needed most. . . . It is not concerned with life in its detail, but with life in its core of worth and significance. It is offering the one pearl of great price by which all precious pearls are appraised.' For culture apart from religion suffers inevitable decline, humanism ends by losing faith in human life. When that stage is reached there is only one way in which the world can be revitalized. It must recover its faith in God and in the eternal value of human life. That was the gift which the early Church brought to the Græco-Roman world. It revealed itself not only as a saving salt, but as a vital and transforming force which penetrated into every sphere of human life.

That is the gift which Christianity offers to the world of to-day. Christ's gospel is not properly an ethic. He did not come to give the world rules of conduct, nor is the Christian life to be merely an *imitatio Christi*. When the matter is viewed in that light insuperable difficulties immediately arise. Christ had His own life and mission to fulfil in its own time and place, so that literal imitation is out of the question, while at the same time His sayings are found to have no direct bearing on many of the problems of to-day. This obviously leads to a denial of the finality and sufficiency of His ethic. But this is altogether to go on the wrong track. 'The eternal value of the recorded sayings of Jesus is not as telling us how we ought to behave, but as telling us about Him, mediating to us His spirit and revealing His fundamental attitudes.' His mission was religious primarily, and not ethical, to redeem human life and reveal its perfection in fellowship with God. Through His own perfect fellowship with God He manifested a spirit of life in all His daily contacts with men, and a sure and infallible instinct for right conduct in every emergency. Thus His ethic is the natural outcome and fruit of His religion. Here we touch the root of the matter. 'The vision

of God's holy love, seen through the windows of Christ's mind and mediated by His Spirit, is the differentia of the Christian ethic.' 'As men are possessed by the Holy Spirit, a "new heart" comes to be fashioned in them; they are made "partakers of the divine nature." All the distinctively Christian claims and insights, with their ethical revaluations and their new range both of humility and heroism, spring from that supernatural source.'

The aim of education is described in modern educational theory sometimes as mental culture, sometimes as vocational training, sometimes as moral discipline, but perhaps most often as the development of personality—the development, as an English educationist recently put it, of 'full and effective' personality. This he regarded as the ultimate end in education, which alone gives value to the whole.

The point we would here make is, that Christian personality corresponds to, and goes far to meet, the educational ideal of 'full and effective' personality.

In the first place, Christian personality is *religious* personality, and religious personality—as we believe—at its best and highest, as being informed with the Spirit of God revealed in Jesus Christ. As such it should go far to meet the educational ideal. For of all the influences making for self-development the influence of religion should be the greatest—the greatest, because the deepest and most pervasive. Religion touches our human life, and affects it profoundly, at all its points. It is our life's hidden potency, our soul's innermost core. Accordingly, in the cultivation of the self we should lay primary stress on the development of spiritual capacity, on the inner experience of fellowship with the Life Divine. If anything will accomplish that unification and integration of personality which is the true aim and goal of our individual life and being, it is the consciousness of eternal God within. Here is the precious secret which may give to our lives unity and completeness. The surest way of attaining one's potential unity, and so of realizing

the ideal of human personality, is to yield oneself freely in love to the indwelling life of our God and Father.

In the second place, Christian personality is *moral* personality, and moral personality—as we believe—at its best and highest, as being informed with the Mind of Christ. As such it should also go far to meet the educational ideal of 'full and effective' personality. Indeed, apart from morals and virtue, it is difficult to think of true personality at all. That great educator, Dr. Arnold of Rugby, has been accused in our day of having sacrificed intelligence to virtue. But the truth is, he put virtue first, and intelligence second. And he was surely right. A non-religious intelligence may be actuated, indeed is often actuated, by pure humanitarian principle, but a non-moral intelligence is a positive menace to society.

Which leads to the reminder that the Christian moral principle is not the pagan ideal of self-assertion, nor the naturalistic ideal of æsthetic culture, but the humanitarian ideal of brotherly love. There is no true self-realization, according to Christianity, apart from the social community and its needs. Not God and self alone, but God and self and neighbour, are at the making of Christian personality. The truer self is the fuller self. The more our life is merged in the life and well-being of others we receive it back again richer and more complete. In self-expenditure we meet with self-enrichment, in self-sacrifice with self-realization. It is part of the great truth of the social nature of personality—a truth to which modern thought and research have given fresh meanings, but whose essential meaning was grasped long ago by Him who said, 'He that loseth his life shall find it.'

Such, then, is Christian personality. It corresponds to, and goes far to meet, the educational ideal of 'full and effective' personality. Our religion teaches us that there should be an ingoing of the self upon God, marked by gratitude, adoration, and consecration; also an outgoing of the self towards others, marked by sympathy and

benevolence, and even by a Christlike passion for doing good.

In his interesting book, *Mystical Studies in the Apocalypse*, just published, Provost Erskine HILL has a chapter on 'The Apocalyptic Elements in the Gospels' which is challenging enough to merit some consideration. The main contention in this chapter is that our Lord was not speaking of the end of the world at all in the gospel 'apocalypse,' but of something less final. The Provost insists on two preliminary points. One is that the standpoint of the Divine Speaker must be taken into account, and the other that He inevitably spoke in parables, human language being inadequate to deal with such mysteries.

The standpoint is not that of earth but that of heaven. In apocalypse we have the view of earthly events taken from the heaven side, the view which the angels take. We, looking from our side, see first the earthly and then, far off, the heavenly. God sees from the other side. And that is why mere scholarship is not sufficient for the interpretation of apocalyptic visions. The mystical sense is of more value. But further, just because the Divine interpretation of earthly events must necessarily be expressed in symbols and pictures, it is a mistake to apply the current popular 'apocalyptic' ideas and language as a standard or key in the 'light' of which to understand the apocalyptic visions in the New Testament. These visions have a Divine meaning which is far above the popular vague imaginations.

But there is another mistake in the way the apocalyptic language has been read which is as deadly and misleading. It is the meaning given to *συντελεία τοῦ αἰῶνος*. It is often translated, even by good scholars, as 'the end of the world.' This distresses Provost HILL immeasurably. 'It is not too much to say that the thought of Christians (including scholars) has been poisoned,' he says, 'by the assumption that in this discourse our Lord is referring to the end of the world. Yet eminent scholars allow themselves to be led by the facility

of a familiar and mistranslated phrase to assume that the Parousia involves the end of all things earthly. As a matter of fact the winding up of an age, the close of an epoch, which is all that the words imply, has no necessary connexion with "the end of the world." . . . We shall never understand our Lord's apocalyptic sayings till we cease to read them through the glare and haze of the *Dies Irae*, and learn to attach no more than their intrinsic value to the opinions of the *σάρκικοι* of the primitive Church, and to banish what we know is a mis-translation, if not out of the Bible, at least out of our minds.'

There have been many 'great and terrible days of the Lord' in the history of mankind, days of judgment in which the accumulated evil of the age at length bursts into flame and is burnt out in suffering; 'benignant fever paroxysms' which pass and leave humanity prostrate but purified. Such a day of judgment was the French Revolution, when the explosive material to which every groan of the hungry and oppressed under that gilded and corrupt civilization had contributed, at length caught fire and smote the earth with a curse. And such a great and terrible day of the Lord at the time when Christ spoke His warning words was quickly drawing nigh to bring to a close in fire and blood the long age of Israel's probation; and all the righteous blood that had been shed while the age lasted was to be required of that generation. And such a day of judgment, on a far vaster scale, the world is still passing through at the present time. But all this has nothing to do with the end of the world. It is among the pangs in which an old age perishes that a new age is born, and the world still goes on. Yet it is not without warning that epochs are so brought to a close. It was a wonder to Christ that even the Pharisees could not recognize the signs of the approaching doom.

It may seem that too much stress has been laid on this particular error. But see the harm it has done and goes on doing! 'So wise a man as the late Henry Sidgwick,' says the late Bishop Gore, 'was alienated from the faith and membership of the Christian Church mainly by the conviction that

Jesus Christ had² certainly proclaimed the immediate coming of the end of the world and that it had not come as He prophesied. Jesus, he thought, was certainly under a delusion, and could not therefore be what Christendom believed Him to be.' Even so good a scholar as the late Dr. Swete fell into the same error. He regarded the language of our Lord about the Parousia as a fore-shortened view of the future shared by the whole apostolic age. The Parousia was the 'final sifting of mankind.' But why 'final'? asks the protesting Provost. What authority had Dr. Swete for assuming that a 'coming' of the Christ necessarily implies the end of the world?

It is the old error lying at the back of all these wrestlings with the text—the habit of assuming that our Lord meant His sayings to be interpreted by the not very enlightened minds of the first Christian communities. Even Dr. Denney, though he speaks in guarded language, falls into the same error. He also takes the view that the apocalyptic utterances of Jesus are a 'fore-shortened' vision of the future. To him the most important thing about the Second Advent in the New Testament is that in its dated and spectacular form it disappears. In the Fourth Gospel the eschatological hopes of the earlier Gospels are not simply omitted; they are replaced. Instead of a coming of the Son of Man on the clouds of heaven, we have the coming of the Spirit. The Evangelist takes it for granted that in this substitution of a spiritual for an outward coming he is true to the mind of the Master.

In regard to all this Provost HILL says that, apart from the distorting medium of the ideas and sayings of the first Christian believers, there is not one word which justifies us in thinking that either the Christ or those apostles who heard Him believed in His immediate visible return to the world after His Ascension. He justifies this assertion by an exposition of certain passages. Take, for example, this one: 'Behold he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him . . .' This obviously refers to our Lord's first coming. St. John is quoting two Old Testament passages, blending them and applying them, and looking back on the first

Advent. What, indeed, do these words 'with clouds' really mean? They are a technical apocalyptic expression which simply suggests that the reality is veiled from worldly sight. And it was so veiled when Jesus was on earth. Christ always comes 'with clouds,' and only the mystical eye really sees Him.

These apocalyptic phrases are symbolic media in which spiritual realities are suggested. If Jesus Christ were to appear among us to-day it would be 'in power and glory,' but it would also be 'with clouds.' The reality would be hidden from the fleshly eye. When our Lord explained to the disciples the 'sign of his coming,' He did three things, and these are the three things in His apocalyptic discourse. First, He gives in general terms the signs by which the close of an age may be recognized. Then He gives His followers the immediate signs of the closing of that particular age. And finally He answers the question as to the signs of His own coming (not His second coming; they had no thought of that, but His manifestation).

The words of Jesus rightly interpreted refer, not to some future cataclysm in history, but to a transcendental experience which was literally fulfilled in the lifetime of some at least of those who heard Him. To the awakened spiritual sense there became visible to them, as, under the same conditions, it does to us, the continuous Coming of the Son of Man—the vision of the 'Light that lighteth every man' coming like a great dawn into the world. We materialize the apocalyptic language, and look at events from the earth side, and we have been deluded by mistaking the meaning of our Lord's reference to the 'age.' But if we read Him correctly, and realize that apocalypse is just the heavenly view of what goes on here, expressed in parable, we shall see that there is no error in our Lord's words, and no spectacular historical crisis ahead of us which is the final rounding up of humanity, but a great Divine Reality, manifested at the first advent under certain conditions, and always so manifested, and always to be manifested in the course of the ages.

Present Tendencies in the Criticism of the Gospels.

BY PROFESSOR C. H. DODD, M.A., D.D., MANCHESTER.

THE task of Gospel criticism in the nineteenth century is well described in the phrase adopted as the English title of Albert Schweitzer's great work, 'The Quest of the Historical Jesus.' As a stage in that task it undertook to analyse the documentary sources and to estimate their historical value. The principles of source-analysis it applied were those already tested in the study of the Old Testament as well as of secular history. The first step was to recognize that the Fourth Gospel did not stand on the same footing with the other three. The picture it presents was seen to be so different from that of the Synoptic Gospels that a choice had to be made, and on fully adequate grounds it was decided that the Synoptics must be regarded as primary, and the Fourth Gospel as secondary. Thus the criticism of the Fourth Gospel proceeded on its own lines, and the main object of historical criticism was the first three. After long investigation and discussion, certain main conclusions emerged: that of the three Mark was the earliest, and was presupposed as a source by the other two, and that besides Mark a second written source, often denominated 'Q,' was employed by Matthew and Luke. This 'two-document hypothesis' has stood the test of time. It has maintained itself against attack from every conceivable quarter, and it does not seem likely that it will ever be successfully challenged. Recent work on source-criticism, such as that of Canon Streeter and of Professor Bacon, while it may modify some accepted ideas of the sources, and certainly carries analysis further in profitable ways, builds upon the two-document hypothesis and leaves it more secure than ever. Mark and Q remain our two fundamental sources for the life and teaching of Jesus. Thus far nineteenth-century criticism fulfilled its task with complete success.

But when the earliest written sources have been recognized, we are still far from an objective record of the facts. Neither Mark nor Q can well be dated before the sixties of the first century. A generation had elapsed since the death of Jesus before either had been written down. An attempt was made in some quarters to minimize the significance of this interval by claiming at least mediate apostolic authority for the two fundamental sources. Mark, it was said, was simply Peter's reminiscences reduced to writing; Q was a translation of Matthew's collection of the 'Logia' or Sayings of

Jesus. The latter view rested on an unlucky guess at the meaning of an obscure passage in Papias, and has no probability. The former view exaggerates what is probably true, namely, that a Petrine tradition, whether at first or second hand, was widely used by the author of the Second Gospel; but close analysis of the Gospel from Johannes Weiss' *Das älteste Evangelium* to Professor Bacon's *The Gospel according to Mark*, has shown that it is by no means homogeneous, and that the very arguments by which the Petrine origin of some portions is supported tells against such an origin for other portions. Mark is in no sense a transcript of an apostle's reminiscences. It is a compilation of material from various sources. Thus we are compelled to allow for chances of development or corruption in the tradition going beyond possible infirmities of memory in two elderly apostles. We have to ask, What happened to the tradition between A.D. 30 and 60, in the formative period of the Christian religion? The answer given by nineteenth-century criticism was, broadly, that the theological development which we observe between Mark and John was a continuation of the theological development which had already shaped the tradition into the form which we find in Mark and Q. Thus it was always on the look out for *Gemeinde-theologie*—theological reflection on the part of the Church—and insisted that any element in the record which might be suspected of coming under that head should be eliminated as unhistorical. The extremely jejune result which emerged when such a principle was rigorously applied was for some time concealed, partly because critics were not sufficiently sensitive to *Gemeinde-theologie*, and allowed much to pass which on the principle should have been rejected, and partly because imagination came to the help of criticism in its need. In many of the Lives of Jesus which were put forth in the late nineteenth century the fancy or predilections of the critic played a larger part than was often recognized. The radical criticism of scholars like Wellhausen and Wrede, and even the extravagances of the 'Christ-myth' school which curiously flourished at the end of the century, prepared the way for Albert Schweitzer's devastating survey of a century's *Lebenjesforschung*, or Quest of the Historical Jesus. Schweitzer's own reconstruction has proved no more tenable than those which he exposed. His

service was to shock the critical world into seeing how insecurely its work stood, and how little positive and generally accepted result the Quest of the Historical Jesus had really attained. The first part of its task nineteenth-century criticism performed to admiration. In the second part it could not claim any decisive success. It could not convince us that it knew the facts about 'the Historical Jesus,' because it could not tell us what happened to the tradition between A.D. 30 and 60. Its attempts to tell were shown to be assumptions or guesses.

In the years since the War a new method of criticism has come to the fore in Germany, under the name of *Formgeschichte*. Its exponents distinguish it from *Literaturgeschichte*, and especially from *Quellengeschichte*. Our natural equivalents for these terms are 'Literary Criticism' and 'Source-criticism.' Thus *Formgeschichte* is perhaps best rendered 'Form-criticism.' Its practitioners remind us that purely literary source-criticism has no truly objective means of taking us behind the two fundamental documentary sources, Mark and Q. It may attempt further documentary analysis, but the results of such analysis can never attain to the objectivity of the two-document hypothesis. They therefore propose a fresh approach. Whatever written sources may or may not lie behind Mark and Q, certainly at one stage the material out of which these and other sources were composed existed in oral tradition. They formed part of the folk-tradition of a community. Now students of comparative folk-lore have been able to recognize certain general laws governing the forms into which folk-tradition falls, and to deduce from these forms conclusions regarding the life and thought of the society out of which they came. The *Formgeschichtler* propose to apply the methods of comparative folk-lore to the oral tradition lying behind the Gospels.

Professor Karl Ludwig Schmidt of Bonn, in his book *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu*, showed that the primary constituents of the Gospel sources were small units of narrative or sayings, each originally complete in itself. It is with these units that the *Formgeschichtler* start. They study their various forms, and try to establish for these forms their true *Sitz im Leben*—their setting in the actual life of the Christian community in the pre-literary stage. Thus certain units show by their form that they belonged to the early preaching of the Gospel, as we know it from Acts and from allusions in the Pauline Epistles. Others show that they formed part of the catechetical instruction given to converts, or that they were used in controversy with opponents of

the Church. Others, again, reflect early stages in the growth of a Christian theology, while others by their strongly dramatic and picturesque character suggest that they grew out of the simple desire to tell stories about a revered and beloved Personality. The interest of criticism is thus directed upon the life and experience and thought of the Christian community in the generation preceding the beginning of Gospel writing. Whereas the earlier liberal criticism sought to isolate elements which it could label *Gemeindeftheologie*, and then put these aside as irrelevant to its main purpose (the Quest of the Historical Jesus), the new criticism fixes attention upon just such elements, but instead of relegating them all to the comparatively abstract category 'Theology,' it sets before us the rich and many-sided experience of a community, living the Christian life, practising Christian cults, thinking out the implications of its faith, and commending it to the outside world. Whether or not we can attain sure knowledge about the life of Jesus, we may at least know more than we have realized about the life of His community in its earliest years. How far Form-criticism may also contribute to the Quest of the Historical Jesus itself, in the sense understood by earlier criticism, is a point on which exponents of the method are not yet clear. Dibelius (*Formgeschichte des Evangeliums*) and Bultmann (*Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*) in varying degrees attempt to draw conclusions from their form-criticism with regard to the historicity of this or that element in the Gospel record, but their conclusions are different and often contradictory. Dibelius's tendency is at least relatively positive, Bultmann's almost fiercely negative. The judgment of K. L. Schmidt seems the soberest. He frankly confesses that *Formgeschichte* does not directly provide, and does not aim at providing, a new criterion for the historicity of the Gospel facts. All adherents of the school would agree with him that this at least is not its primary aim. For they all share in a movement characteristic of German theological thought since the War—a movement of revolt against what they call *Historismus*, i.e. the view that the essence of Christianity (*Das Wesen des Christentums*) can be determined by recovering the precise facts regarding the words and deeds of the Founder, and that anything which His followers made of those facts must be regarded as more or less corruption of the pure Gospel. It is their merit to have pointed out that the *whole* of the tradition embodied in the Gospel comes down to us counter-signed by the experience and faith of the early Church, without which there would have been no

tradition. The attempt to discover elements in the record which could not possibly have been produced by the experience or reflection of the early Church, and which therefore must be historical, is illusory, as indeed clear-sighted and thoroughgoing liberal critics like Wellhausen had seen. But while the new critics seem to close one avenue to a knowledge of the Jesus of History, they invite us to consider more seriously another possible approach. After all, is it not possible that the best way to learn the facts about Jesus is to learn what His life and teaching meant for those who were in the best position to understand their significance?

The school of *Formgeschichte* has not, I think it must be admitted, as yet produced a work of really first-class quality (unless we except K. L. Schmidt's book, which is rather preparatory to *Formgeschichte*), nor have its achieved results so far been commensurate with the *éclat* with which it has been announced. Its conclusions so far are very vulnerable. But it would be a mistake to undervalue its importance. When the instrument has been improved, when the practitioners have worked out more adequate canons of criticism, and when it has been more thoroughly applied, we may expect more significant results. But already the school has done great service. If he who solves a problem deserves well of his fellow-students, so does he, and hardly in less measure, who states a problem in a new and suggestive form. This the *Formgeschichte* school has done, and it has thereby given new life to Gospel criticism. The new approach should lead us far in the understanding of Christianity as a living religion, and consequently towards an understanding of its Founder, as He is presented to us in the Gospels.

I now turn to the Fourth Gospel. As we have seen, it was a real gain at one stage of Gospel criticism that the study of the Fourth Gospel was separated from that of the Synoptics, and allowed to progress upon its own lines. It cannot, however, be said that nineteenth-century criticism was as successful with the Johannine Problem as it was with the Synoptic Problem. It produced no universally accepted theory like the two-document hypothesis, nor did it drive off the field the traditional view of the Gospel. At the end of the century, in fact, the rival views confronted one another in a kind of trench warfare which promised no decision. The conservatives started from the external attestation of the Gospel as the work of the Son of Zebedee—an attestation which is *prima facie* strong. In the Gospel itself they laid stress on the apparently explicit claim that the author was a disciple, and sought corroboration for the claim by emphasizing

elements in the Gospel which showed knowledge of first-century Palestine, its geography, political institutions, customs, and religious conditions; and further, upon elements which as they thought compelled one to admit that the author was either an eye-witness or a forger, either an intimate of Jesus or a liar. The discourses, unlike as they are to those of the Synoptic Gospels, they were prepared to accept as a transcript of the deeper and more esoteric teaching of Jesus, recorded by a disciple better fitted to appreciate it than the Synoptic Evangelists. Thus they held the Fourth Gospel to be actually more authoritative than the others, as the work of a peculiarly intimate disciple. The Liberals on the other hand started from the internal evidence of the Gospel, considered in relation to its environment. Its advanced theology seemed to them to presuppose the work of Paul, in fact, to be best understood as a development of Paulinism. Its controversial tone appeared to be related to questions which agitated the Church at a relatively late period. They found it to be pervaded with ideas of a Gnostic cast more at home in the second century than in the first. In its references to first-century conditions they pointed out certain obvious errors or misconceptions. Its discourses they refused to accept as utterances of the same Person who spoke in the Synoptics. Its narrative they regarded as largely shaped by a process of theological allegory.

At the close of the nineteenth century neither side could claim a decisive victory; for while each side could damage its opponent's case, both could point to facts not adequately accounted for on the opposing theory. The position was something like a deadlock, and indeed for many years the question did not seem to move forward in the least. But during the present century fresh advances have been made which have had the cumulative effect of giving the Johannine problem a quite different setting.

The first step was the abandonment by both sides of the dogma of the unity of the Gospel. Conservative and liberal alike—a Loisy¹ as much as a Westcott—had held tenaciously to the view that the Gospel was a 'seamless robe,' the original product of a single mind all through, whether the mind of the Son of Zebedee or of a second-century Hellenist. Almost suddenly, through the initiative of liberal critics like Wellhausen and Strachan, as well as of relatively conservative critics like Spitta and Garvie, this dogma was abandoned on all sides. To-day there is hardly a scholar of note who would maintain the strict homogeneity of the work.

¹ In the first edition of *Le Quatrième Evangile*.

Even so ultra-conservative a commentator as the late Archbishop Bernard no longer attributes the Gospel as a whole to the Beloved Disciple, but distinguishes the tradition handed down by the Son of Zebedee from the Gospel composed on the basis of that tradition by a follower of his. This single admission has opened the way to fresh solutions of hitherto insoluble problems.

Next, I should place the re-entry of the Johannine Problem into the orbit of the Synoptic Problem. It is one of the merits of Canon Streeter's book, *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins*, that it shows that the case of the Fourth Gospel is after all not wholly different from that of the Synoptics. Like Matthew and Luke it uses Mark as a source, together with one or more unknown sources. Like Luke it draws on narrative traditions alien from those of Mark. Like Matthew it puts into the mouth of Jesus discourses which as such are the composition of the Evangelist, even though the methods of composition are very different. From the other side the advent of *Formgeschichte* brings the Synoptic and the Johannine problems into relation. It shows that the units of which the Fourth Gospel is composed are in part at least similar in form to the units of the Synoptics, and that where the form is different it may be explained in the same way by reference to the growing life and experience of the Church. While the isolation of the Johannine Problem was at one stage an advantage, it is clear that at the present stage it stands to gain by sharing the advances made in Synoptic criticism.

Thirdly, the relation of the Fourth Gospel to other early Christian literature can now be reconsidered in the light of recent investigation. Here the discovery of the Odes of Solomon, and the discussion thereby provoked, has had important results. The Odes, a document more likely of the first century than of later date, have some astonishingly 'Johannine' traits, and yet it seems improbable that they are indebted to the Fourth Gospel. In many ways their closest affinity is with the Epistles of Ignatius. The Johannine traits in Ignatius have always been something of a problem, and critics have been undecided whether they are due to borrowing or to parallel development of thought. It now seems likely that in the Odes, Ignatius, and the Fourth Gospel we have three pieces of evidence for a type of Christian thought with roots far back behind the date of the writings themselves. In the light of this, certain points of contact between the Fourth Gospel and 1 Peter and James acquire importance (the latter were emphasized by Ewald in *Das Hauptproblem der Evangelienfrage* [1890], but in the

then state of criticism he could not see their true bearing). It now looks as if the dependence of John on Paul had been greatly exaggerated. We have to allow for a strain of thought in early Christianity persisting alongside the Pauline strain—a Jewish-Hellenistic strain beginning far back, and developing in the direction indicated by the Fourth Gospel, the Odes, and Ignatius.

Fourthly, there has been much fresh study of the Jewish background of the Gospel. Here Burney's *The Aramaic Original of the Fourth Gospel* has played an important part. He does not, indeed, seem to have convinced scholars competent to judge, of the soundness of his thesis that the Gospel according to John as we have it is a translation of an Aramaic document. But he has compelled us all to admit that behind the Gospel in Greek, or behind portions of it, lies a mind that thought in Aramaic—the mind, therefore, of a Jew and not of a Greek Gnostic.

When once this is admitted, we scan with renewed interest the extensive work which has been done on first-century Judaism both by Jewish scholars like Abrahams, Montefiore, and Klein, and by Christian scholars like Strack and Billerbeck and George Foote Moore. The results are striking, and I must confess astonishing to one brought up on the older liberal theories. Very many passages in the Fourth Gospel show a direct relation to Rabbinic thought. The controversies, for example, on the Sabbath, and on the Messiah, can be directly illustrated from Jewish sources. Such a typical piece of Johannine theology as 'Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day' is shown by Strack-Billerbeck to be rooted in a piece of Rabbinic exegesis. The conception of the Light of the World is traced through Sirach, Jochanan ben Zacchai, and *Baba Bathra*. Even the characteristic mysticism of the Fourth Gospel, thought to be so alien from anything Jewish, is connected by Rabbi Klein¹ with the teaching of the so-called *Doreshe Reshumoth* ('Interpreters of Writings') in which the 'hidden name' (*Shem HammePhorash*) of God is *Ani w' Hu*, expressing the idea, 'I and he are one.' These are only scattered examples of the kind of new light which is shed upon the Fourth Gospel from Jewish studies. In the face of them it would be rash to deny that at some stage at any rate the tradition embodied in the Gospel passed through the mind of some one soaked in first-century Palestinian Judaism.

Fifthly, if the Jewish strain in Johannine thought has received unexpected illumination, so has that strain in it which was supposed to be farthest removed from the Jewish matrix of Christianity—the Gnostic strain. Recent study of Gnosticism has

¹ *Der Älteste Christliche Catechismus*.

greatly altered the view of it taken by nineteenth-century scholars. Briefly, we now regard it not as a heretical form of Christianity which appeared in the second century, but as a great religious movement, older than Christianity, which was sweeping the Hellenistic world about the time that Christianity appeared, and from the middle of the first century attempted to gather Christianity into its all-embracing system, as it had already gathered in elements from various religions of the ancient world, including Judaism. The researches of Reitzenstein and Bousset have done much to illuminate its true character, and the most important documents of non-Christian Gnosticism, comprised in the Hermetic Corpus, have recently been re-edited for English readers by the late Walter Scott. The affinity of Johannine thought with certain types of Gnostic thought, particularly with that of the *Hermetica*, is clearer than ever, but with our new knowledge of Gnosticism we see that that does not mean that the Johannine Gospel is necessarily late, or that it stands very far apart from the Jewish environment in which Christianity took its rise. The earliest Hermetic writings themselves depend in part on the Septuagint.

But the most startling impact of the study of Gnosticism upon the problem of the Fourth Gospel comes from the work of Reitzenstein, Bultmann, and others on the Mandæan Scriptures. The Mandæans are a religious community in Southern Iraq, whose beliefs, as indicated by the phrase *Manda d'chajje*, 'Knowledge of the Life,' represent a development of ancient Gnosticism. The first reference to them in literature is in the eighth century, but their origin is certainly earlier. Their scriptures are extant in various MSS, the oldest of which, in the Bodleian Library, goes back to 1529. They have been translated into German by Lidzbarski. Their contents are of course much earlier than the oldest MS. They are a farrago of materials belonging to various ages and drawn from various sources. Reitzenstein believes that he is able to isolate one document at least which can definitely be dated to a period before the Fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. In some of the Mandæan Scriptures an important rôle is assigned to John the Baptist. The early Roman Catholic missionaries who met the Mandæans in the fifteenth century called them 'Christians of St. John.' Bultmann, holding the theory that the Mandæans are the descendants of a sect actually founded by John the Baptist, attributes to this sect an early form of the Gnostic beliefs which developed into Mandaism as we know it. Now Christianity confessedly arose in close contact with the movement

under John the Baptist, and it has long been recognized that polemic against a Baptist sect is one of the motives of the Fourth Gospel. Bultmann suggests that the Fourth Gospel, which shows many parallels to ideas of a Gnostic type preserved in the Mandæan Scriptures, represents a very early form of Christian belief which felt the necessity of distinguishing itself from the Gnosticism of the followers of John the Baptist. It may even be, he thinks, that it is nearer to primitive Christianity than Paul or the Synoptic Gospels themselves.

The whole Mandæan question is very much under discussion at present. Damaging criticisms of Bultmann's theory, and of Reitzenstein's view of the Mandæan Scriptures on which it rests, have been made by Büchsel in Germany, Burkitt in this country, and others. It is hardly likely that his paradoxical theory will be accepted as it stands. But we may well be led to believe that there was in Christianity from its earliest times a strain of thought more closely akin to the Gnostic movement than we have supposed, and that the Fourth Gospel, though it may itself be a relatively late composition, works with ideas which were not alien to early Christianity.

From this fragmentary survey it will be clear that the Johannine Problem is very much alive. For those who are working at it there is a stimulating sense of things moving, of new light coming, and of the possibility of a definite advance towards a solution. Many of the old controversies now seem antiquated. The questions of authorship and date have lost much of their interest. It is significant that while so conservative a critic as Bernard rejects the authorship of the Son of Zebedee, a liberal like Deissmann is prepared to consider it. The fact is that whether it was written by John or by another person of the same name (to recall a pleasantry of Harnack's), we know pretty well what sort of a book it is with which we are dealing. It is not an historical work, even in the sense in which the Synoptics are historical works. Yet it embodies elements of good historical tradition—much more of this than nineteenth-century liberal criticism would have allowed. But this historical material is placed at the service of a definite theory of the meaning of Christianity. The Evangelist, holding the Platonic view of the phenomenal world as a copy of the eternal world of real existences, finds in the things that Jesus said and did 'signs' or symbols of the eternally Real. His whole life is a manifestation in space and time of the Logos, the eternal constitutive Meaning of things. Its record is all through (in the old phrase) 'an earthly story with a heavenly

meaning'; and that heavenly meaning he would have his readers catch. They were asking the questions which were being asked by seekers for truth all over the Hellenistic world. Granting that our goal is 'life eternal,' and that life eternal is 'to know God, the only Real,' how shall we attain it? Through initiation into the Mysteries? Through occult or esoteric lore? Through contemplation? Through philosophy? Through mystical ecstasy? These were some of the answers given. Our author replies, By living the life of the 'friends' of Christ; by faith, love, and obedience towards a Person in whom the whole Meaning of things was 'made flesh.' The historical facts of the life of Jesus had created a community, and within it they had become something more than remembered facts, for their eternal meaning had entered into the experience of His friends. The Master who had broken bread for them, became to them the Real Bread of the soul; He who had given them to drink of the fruit of the vine was known to them as the Real Vine whose branches they were. His story, which had once happened in space and time, was repeated perpetually

as the drama of redemption in the soul. Out of this life of the community of the friends of Christ the Fourth Gospel comes, interpreting the facts through their value in experience. But so do the other Gospels in their way, only that the process of interpretation is less reflective, less self-conscious, and untouched by the mystical and philosophical strain which dominates the Fourth Gospel.

The new tendencies in the Criticism of the Gospels should be welcomed by all for whom the historical study of Christianity means the study of a living religion in its varying manifestations. The new criticism lays less stress on minute textual analysis of sources, and questions of precise date and authorship, and more upon the human factors which went to the shaping of the material. It seeks to approach the Central Figure of the Gospels, not so much through an attempt to assess the precise factual value of each separate statement made in them concerning the words and deeds of Jesus, but rather through an understanding of the new life which emerged in the community created by His ministry, death, and resurrection.

The Guidance of God.

A STUDY OF THE OXFORD GROUP MOVEMENT.

BY THE REVEREND J. P. THORNTON-DUESBURY, CORPUS CHRISTI COLLEGE, OXFORD.

'ALMOST in secret, a strange work has been going on for the last two or three years among the undergraduates of many universities, not only here in England, but all over the world. This work of which the general public knows nothing at all, and of which the religious authorities so far as I can gather have never heard, is the activity of a single person.'

So wrote Harold Begbie nine short years ago.¹ That work, still thus unknown in 1923, began with the dynamic change in the life of one man, Frank N. D. Buchman, at the Keswick Convention of 1908. To-day it has spread till it has links and contacts in every quarter of the world. Without formal organization, without financial appeal, a vital message has passed from one to another, as God has set men's hearts on fire. The leaders of the Oxford Group, as it has come to be called, have

been bombarded with requests for visits not only by England and Scotland, by Holland, Germany, and Switzerland, but by Egypt and Turkey and South Africa, by India and China, by America North and South. To the Summer House-party of the Group in Oxford last July came leaders in many Churches at home and overseas. The religious press has had article after article describing one aspect or another of the work.

All this, we believe, is the fruit of no merely human endeavour, but the work of God Himself. In any great spiritual movement what matters in the last analysis is the secret transaction between God and the individual soul. It is from such beginnings that there rise those motions of the Spirit which affect whole classes and nations, races and continents, transforming society and remoulding civilization. The history of the Christian Church is full of such stories ever since a little group of men and women, gathered in an upper

¹ *Life Changers* (Mills & Boon, 1923). The fourth (revised) edition was published in 1929.

room, gave their lives to Jesus Christ in such wholehearted devotion that they went out from Jerusalem and 'turned the world upside down.'

We need not here recall the lessons of that history. Such names as St. Francis and Martin Luther, Ignatius Loyola and John Wesley, come immediately to our minds. But at all such epochs certain essential principles of evangelism, inherent in the New Testament, but at times forgotten, inevitably reappear, and they were perhaps never more simply expressed than in two brief sentences: 'People matter more than things,' and 'God does guide.' It is with the second of these fundamental theses that we are here concerned, and what follows springs from the writer's personal experience and observation in an intimate fellowship with the Oxford Group over a number of years.

'The Purpose of God in the Life of the World.'

In recent times that phrase has become almost a *cliché* with many of us, and it is unlikely that many of those who read this article will deny the existence of some Divine Plan in history, dimly understood no doubt by our limited human apprehension, yet traceable time and again by those who have eyes to see. Far back in the history of the Universe science tells us of a flaming ball, broken off from the sun and slowly, through unimaginable stretches of geological time, cooling down and taking shape as the earth on which we live. The modern Christian traces the Hand of God working through storm and rain and earthquake, making the world a place on which life could at length appear. He traces that same Hand working with other tools to produce variation of species and the long climb up the ladder of ascending forms of life. At last he sees the process crowned, thus far at least, by the appearance of man, and, as history proper begins, he sees the Purpose of God no longer working merely with the unconscious tools of elemental forces, but calling increasingly for the free co-operation of conscious beings.

Above all, the story of this call to free co-operation is written in the pages of the Bible. Again and again God is represented as speaking to men by various means, and summoning, challenging, guiding them to perform His will. Abraham goes out from his father's house, 'not knowing whither,' but obedient to the call. Moses, faithfully performing the shepherd's monotonous task, is suddenly confronted with the Eternal God of Purpose (I AM and I WILL BE) in an experience that revolutionizes his whole life, and not his only, but the life and history of that slave nation to whom he

is bidden to return. Isaiah is sent out from the Temple with a message to his people from their God; Jeremiah's fears of his inadequacy are reassured; Ezekiel receives his commission through the stormy wind and cloud and fire out of the north. All these and a thousand others, named and unnamed, each as he or she heard God calling and obeyed, prepared the way for the fulfilment of God's Purpose, 'to sum up all things in Christ.'

So, 'in the fulness of the times,' Christ came, 'emptying himself' in a great act of loving choice and assuming the limitations of space and time which hedge in human life. And He too, as Perfect Man, hears a call and obeys. He must 'be about His Father's business'—already in boyhood that conviction is there; the preaching of John the Baptist finds an answering echo in His heart; at the Baptism, His commission is given and sealed; He is Messiah, and the Spirit drives Him up into the wilderness to determine what the Messiahship is to mean. Through long nights of prayer, through His waiting upon God before the choice of the Twelve, amid the moonlight and the shadows of Gethsemane, we see Him still relying upon direction from above, 'doing the will of His Father and finishing His work.' Through the triumph of the Resurrection and Ascension He returns to the place whence He came. But the work goes on, and the Spirit, which proceeds from Him and from His Father, is active in His followers and in those unkindled by their fire of love and service.

Study of the story thus briefly sketched reveals two essential features in the Christian Doctrine of God. He is immanent in the whole life-process of the Universe which He has made. But He is no mere *élan vital*; He is personal and transcendent, too. The Divine movement which we can trace in the Bible story and in the history of the Church has never ceased. The Oxford Group to-day hold spiritual kinship with all those who have realized in experience the truth that Karl Barth and his school are proclaiming in Germany; the truth that God is still free to act, breaking in (*von jenseits*) upon the world and upon men—and that He does.

This, it seems to me, is the metaphysical basis of the doctrine of Guidance taught by the Group, and it is in full accord with the teaching of the Bible. We must go on to consider the sphere and nature of this operation of God, and once again I should like to emphasize that what is said is not *à priori* theory, resting on the preceding metaphysic, but is the fruit of positive experience from which illustration could be given at every point.

We have said that God still acts freely upon men,

speaking to them as deep calling to deep, and this to men of every class and race and every state of belief or unbelief. In my ministerial experience I have frequently seen this happen, when, in the course of a meeting, the leader has called for a moment or two of quiet before God, and in that quiet waiting the Spirit has spoken to some one present and a changed life has been the result. I have listened, too, to the stories of those who have told how the Spirit has moved and called them in the silence of their own rooms, and quietly, maybe with little or no emotion, they have answered that call. Above all, in talks with individuals, I have found the value and importance of suggesting such a time of quiet, which frees the way for God to speak to the heart when ordinary human words have failed. Among many others, there is an undergraduate at an Oxford College to-day, preparing for the ministry and being greatly used by God among his fellow-undergraduates, all because, in such a time of silence, God spoke to him, convicted him of sin, and later called him to His service.

But while the recognition of this operation of God in the heart of the non-Christian is of supreme importance for all evangelistic work, we are more immediately concerned with the experience of Guidance in Christian life itself. Once again the members of the Oxford Group, as so many have done before them, have re-discovered the truth that those who will give themselves without reserve or compromise to be used by God as and when and where He pleases, do receive His guidance and illumination, and that as they follow His leading, they become increasingly sensitive to it at all times and in all places, until it becomes for them the norm of life. This, of course, does not mean the supersession of the intellect; rather, it issues in its quickening. God does not give guidance to save a man the trouble of thinking for himself; on the contrary, the graciousness of God's giving summons the recipient to think harder than ever, to marshal all the facts relevant to whatever issue is at stake, to do all that lies in his power to learn the proper course—and throughout the whole process (not simply at its end!) to look up to his Master that His Will only may be done.

The Christian who seeks to live under the guidance of God retains his free will and full responsibility; his conduct preserves all its ethical significance; this is the supreme point in which he differs from the unconscious instruments, the elemental forces, with which God worked in old days and still works; he is an agent, a fellow-labourer, a friend. It is in virtue of this intimate, personal relationship,

no longer the relationship merely of servant and master, that he is permitted to see something, at least, of the inner significance of God's working in and through himself. That was the crowning privilege of the training of the Twelve.

Yet, if the guidance is to become the normal, natural thing in life that God means it to be, there must be complete obedience to it all along the line. St. Paul thinks of himself as the 'slave' (albeit the free, willing slave) of his Master, as well as His fellow-worker and heir. We have seen already, of course, that God does most marvellously guide even those who have not yet acknowledged His Sovereignty; and certainly He guides those who are still far from perfect in their consecration—well for us all that it is so! But if a man would approximate to that state where guidance is all in all to him, he must be obedient all the time, in spirit before it is given, in act when it is received, and through the entire process of its fulfilment. That is the only way to advance.

God gives men His guidance for the fulfilment of His Purpose, for the winning of souls, for the establishment of His Reign, 'That all men may be saved and come to a knowledge of himself.' And because that Purpose is Eternal and Universal, no detail is too small to be irrelevant. It is natural enough to look for guidance in the great choices of life, such as marrying a wife or choosing a career. But the vast design of God's Plan is made up of innumerable tiny pieces, every one of which is significant. In the limitation of our knowledge, it is impossible to say that any particular detail is unimportant. People sometimes speak of the dangers of guidance; it is far more dangerous to live without it.

But the realization of the importance of living under guidance leads obviously to the crucial practical question, '*How* does God guide?' Obviously, in many ways. By His Word in the Bible, interpreted to us by the Spirit, and made even plainer by reverent study and scholarly research. By circumstances, time and again; by the advice of friends—only its value will vary according to the measure of their own consecration; by a thousand and one things. I want here to deal only with one upon which special, but by no means exclusive, emphasis is laid by the Oxford Group—namely, the time of quiet waiting upon God. About this there is nothing new in Christian thought or experience, but the Group urges that in the prayer of communion with God there is a real 'conversation' through which God makes known His will, and those who have been longest in the movement say unanimously that this is the secret

of such success as God has given them. I have frequently heard Dr. Buchman say that it revolutionized his whole ministry when he began to set apart an hour early each morning for quiet waiting upon God. From that time onwards he could 'catch men.'

Most of us use pen and paper to write down the thoughts that come to us in such quiet times. It aids concentration, checking wandering thoughts; it fixes the impressions that come to us; it helps the memory in the fulfilment of orders. Martin Luther seems to have done the same! And 'the quiet time' is not confined to the early part of the day; throughout its hours there is often a 'coming apart' for a minute or two into the silence, from which the 'friend of God' goes out with strength and vision renewed.

Just because this quiet waiting upon God is at the heart of the Group's message and power, it has been subjected to much criticism. 'How do you know it is God speaking? Is it not just your own subconscious thoughts coming up into the conscious sphere? Are you claiming to set up a new infallibility?' In such questions, apart from their phraseology, there is again nothing new. The problems of individual judgment and of error in guidance are as old as the Apostolic Age. But the Group does not teach that every thought that comes into a man's head in a quiet time carries with it the infallibility of a sort of divine tape-machine! Such a doctrine would be alike unintelligent and untrue to experience. *Ex hypothesi*, the thoughts of the God of truth must be absolutely true; but the instrument which receives them is the fallible human mind, with all its possibilities of misunderstanding and misinterpretation. So much is involved in the very fact that the relationship of God and the Christian soul is not mechanical, but intensely warm and personal, though it must never be forgotten that the All-Loving is also the All-Great and that He does guard His children from many a mistake.

Recognizing all this, the Group teaches that God's guidance is to be 'checked' in various ways; we must 'try' the spirits whether they be of God.' If it is God's guidance, it must be in accord with the Mind of Christ revealed in the New Testament; it must be in harmony with the four standards—Christ's Absolute Honesty, Purity, Unselfishness and Love. And because the judgment of the individual may be affected by an incomplete knowledge of the facts, or influenced (though unconsciously) by personal factors, the Group further emphasizes the importance of checking at any rate all obviously large 'concerns' with other consecrated Christians, who believe in Divine guidance. (This is, I believe, also the custom of the Society of Friends.) Such checking not merely provides a valuable safeguard, but frequently leads all concerned to a larger vision of God's Will and the reaping of a richer harvest than the individual had dreamed possible.

Finally, the results? For an answer to this question, I would refer first to the long series of lives brought into touch with the saving and recreating power of God in Jesus Christ through the Oxford Group. Space precludes any account of such miracles here, but their number is swelling every week, and an increasing literature is becoming available to tell the tale. For our present purpose the needful thing is to say once more that in my considered opinion, as well as in those of many others who have had extensive knowledge of the Group, the doctrine of Guidance has been vital in the gaining of this success.

And, lastly, for the individual—despite the mistakes that all of us, in the Group and out of it, have made in our Christian life—the steady, persistent practice of seeking God's Will, not only in the great things, but in the apparently unimportant affairs, leads ultimately (if not always immediately) to a settled, balanced, effective life, disciplined and reliable, capable of increasing usefulness to God in the establishment of His Reign.

Literature.

TROELTSCH.

THERE are certain works by German writers, knowledge of which in the original or in translation is a hall-mark of theological scholarship. We can

scarcely conceive of a scholar whose library does not contain, for instance, Harnack's 'History of Dogma,' Schürer's 'Jewish People in the Time of Christ,' and Wendt's 'Teaching of Jesus.' Alongside these must now be ranked Troeltsch's most

notable work which has at last appeared in English dress as *The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches* (Allen & Unwin; 2 vols., 42s. net).

The translation, by Miss Olive Wyon, is most welcome. Hitherto Troeltsch has failed to find among us the recognition he deserved. For that he was himself to blame. He wrote an almost unbelievably difficult German. His long, involved sentences tried one's patience; before one had made certain of the main predicate, the grammatical subject was forgotten; and unless one made copious notes as one progressed, the significance of a page easily eluded one. This translation is one of the best achievements of the kind that we have seen. Unwieldy sentences have been broken up; paragraphs have been clearly marked and useful sub-headings introduced. The whole reads like English writing, not just obviously translated German. For this relief much thanks. We realize fully now how well worth translation Troeltsch's work was; the only pity is that it was not translated long ere now.

Here is to be found ample material for six months' close study. As Harnack's 'History of Dogma' writes the history of the Church from a certain point of view, so does Troeltsch for his own purpose in these volumes. It is truly a great work to master which will be a liberal education. We are at one with Dr. Gore, who, in an introductory note, remarks, 'it stands without a rival whether in thoroughness or in comprehensiveness as an exposition of Christian life and thought in their relation to contemporary social facts, ideas, and problems'; in so saying, Dr. Gore not only evaluates the work, he adequately indicates its contents. It is in three parts, dealing respectively with the Early Church, Mediæval Catholicism, and Protestantism. Jesus issued a summons rather than a social programme; He just proclaimed the Kingdom of God. Paul presents a union of conservative and revolutionary elements. As the Church grew a new situation developed—opposition between State and Church, and the rise of problems as to property, the family, vocation, charity, and so on.

The section on the mediæval position is most illuminating, and here the historical notes are of great value.

Perhaps most interesting of all is the masterly exposition of the religious ideas and sociological consequences of Protestantism. Here many interesting points are discussed; for example, the connexion of Prussianism with Lutheranism which 'hallowed the realistic sense of power'; or that of Calvinism with capitalism.

Such is the briefest outline of the rich contents of a very remarkable book.

A PARSON'S JOB.

Two books have just been published, both of them unusually interesting and able, dealing with the work of a parish minister in England. The first bears the title given above, *A Parson's Job: Aspects of Work in the English Church*, by the Rev. Leslie S. Hunter, M.A., Canon of Newcastle (S.C.M.; 7s.6d.net). Mr. Hunter is the son of a distinguished Congregational minister in Glasgow, the famous 'John Hunter' whose sermons are still remembered by many people outside his own communion. His sermons were usually about fifty minutes long, but nobody ever complained of their length. Nor did his congregation complain if they were repeated. One Sunday a member brought a friend with him, and, when the text was announced, whispered to him: 'You're in luck. This is one of his best!' It is a pleasant feature of Mr. Hunter's book that he so often refers to his father with affection and loyalty. Of the book itself we may say that it is packed full of a sanctified common sense which the author applies all round to every aspect of church life, often with devastating frankness. This level-headed outlook enables him to go to the heart of many subjects like fasting, communion, preaching, and ceremonial, so that where he has stated his case (always with restraint) you feel there is nothing more to say. His words about pastoral visiting ought to be sounded in the ears of all our young preachers who imagine that the pulpit is their only sphere, and are seldom found sitting at the firesides of their parishioners. On preaching he is at his best, and his opinions may be summed up in a few phrases. There is a great deal of very poor preaching. There is a great deal too much preaching. Sermons should be of different kinds, not all of one type. As to the length, if they are good they cannot be too long, whereas some sermons of ten minutes are exactly ten minutes too long. We could wish that his pages on the training of the clergy could be imprinted on the minds of all College authorities (Scottish and English alike). He thinks that after an academic course, the clergy should be taught (1) how to read aloud, (2) how to keep accounts, (3) how to teach children, (4) some elements of economics, (5) some smattering of local government, (6) how to put a religious truth in the language of to-day, and finally (7) something of the practice of personal life in God. There are other matters,

but it is enough to say that this is a book to be scattered wide in all the Churches among all who are looking forward to the clerical vocation.

The other book is *A Short Handbook of Public Worship in the Church of the Anglican Communion*, by the Rev. Percy Dearmer, D.D., Canon of Westminster (Milford; 2s. 6d. net). This book has been written at the request of and in collaboration with the Worship and Order Group, and published with their full approval. The general standpoint of this group is that not only does religious life mould ceremonial, but ceremonial very really moulds religious life, and that it is urgently necessary that in this matter there should be unity, and that the ceremonial should follow the lines laid down by sound learning. And so Dr. Dearmer goes over the whole field, Matins, Holy Communion, Baptism, Confirmation, and much else, and has guidance for the whole round of Church ceremonial. In its own more restricted field this book is likely to be as useful as Mr. Hunter's, and its wise counsels should help towards that sane and reverent worship which the author wishes to see universal. His first sentence will appeal to many and will show how he can get to the root of reality: 'It may perhaps be questioned whether Apollyon has any more valuable ally, with the exception of the Victorian stained-glass window, than the clerical voice.'

THE PSALMS.

A valuable addition has been made to the slowly advancing series of 'Westminster Commentaries' by Professor W. E. Barnes's commentary on *The Book of Psalms*, in two volumes (Methuen; 42s. net). Its most obvious feature of interest is that it is fully abreast of current criticism and presents to readers unacquainted with foreign languages the substance of much important work that has recently been done by continental scholars. With this interest in novel views and his impartial presentation of them, Dr. Barnes combines a real respect for the work of older and more conservative scholars, and his own work is characterized by open-mindedness blended with caution. This attitude appears perhaps most conspicuously in his treatment of the vexed question of the presence of Maccabean psalms in the Psalter. He is by no means so confident of that presence as some recent scholars. Of Ps 44, for example, he says that the evidence is too slight to prove its Maccabean origin, while of Ps 74 the language is too indefinite to justify us in assigning it confidently to this

period. Indeed, one of the strong points of Dr. Barnes's treatment of the Psalms is that his wholesome doubt as to the possibility of assigning psalms to definite historical occasions throws him back upon the religious contents and value of the Psalms; and in any case that must surely be admitted to be the thing of supreme importance. He does not absolutely rule out the idea that Ps 23 is from David, but 'it is possible that it is by another hand'—the hand of a student of a later generation; in any case what matters is the quiet confidence of the psalm. On Ps 51 he speaks more boldly, regarding it as later than David, and as a confession that might have been made by any penitent who had sinned against the Lord. Again, 'no particular occasion or date can be suggested for Ps 121.' Thus the prefatory sketch of the contents of each psalm is usually followed by an account of its religious character and purpose, and the psalm which is lost to the historian is recovered for the exegete and the preacher.

It is further refreshing to notice, as against the communal interpretation of the Psalms, the emphasis which Dr. Barnes places upon their individual and personal quality. In most cases, he says, 'the Psalmist is an individual speaking with his own voice,' in which we feel 'the fresh outpouring of an individual human spirit approaching Jehovah with the cry, "My God."' This is wholesome doctrine. To Mowinckel's interesting view that the 'makers of mischief' to whom the Psalms occasionally allude are sorcerers or demons he is not very sympathetic: the influence of Babylon on Israel and the Psalter is indubitable, but not very great; the Psalter is rather to be contrasted than equated with Babylonian religion. Nor does he think that Mowinckel's view of certain Psalms (for example, 47, 93, 95-99) as 'Ascension Psalms' is proved—that is, the view which connects them with an annual New Year Festival, on which Jehovah annually ascended His throne; there is no hint of such a festival in Israel. Besides these features of the elaborate introduction, Dr. Barnes deals cautiously with the Messianic Hope, the use of the Psalms in the New Testament and in the Jewish Church, and much else. He finds no prediction in Ps 22; and if there is none there, there is none anywhere.

Needless to say, the exegesis, which is always grounded on a sound knowledge of the text and the versions, is invariably sympathetic with and adequate to the religious contents. For example, the LXX of 84^{7b} suggests the emendation which gives the meaning, 'The God of gods'—or better

still perhaps, 'the God Yahweh'—'appeareth in Zion,' and yields the beautiful thought that the vision of God is the end of the pilgrim way; while he regards Ps 23 as a traveller's psalm throughout—shepherd and sheep are above all things travellers.' Dr. Barnes is very sceptical of the wholesale emendation which has in recent years been practised upon the Psalms. This volume, with its caution, its sympathetic insight, and its emphasis upon religious values, will be welcome alike to the devout reader and the critical student.

IN THE CAUSE OF REUNION.

The Doctrine of Grace (S.C.M.; 15s. net), edited by Mr. W. T. Whitley, M.A., LL.D., is a composite work in which sixteen writers have taken a hand. The Archbishop of York writes a brief Introduction, in which it is described as 'a most interesting and valuable book' and 'a contribution of unique importance to the great enterprise of reunion.'

It should be explained that the writers are British, American, and Continental scholars composing the Theological Committee appointed by the Continuation Committee of the Faith and Order Movement, and that in essaying the explanation of the questions which have divided the Church in the matters of Faith and Order they decided to take up first of all the subject of Grace.

It is a subject which has bulked largely in Christian theology since St. Paul gave it form and shape, although neither in the Eastern nor in the Western Church was there in the beginning a definite theology of grace. It was at two great epochs in Christian history that the Pauline contrast between sin and grace received theological elaboration; in the teaching of St. Augustine, and, again, in the teaching of the Reformers, especially Luther and Calvin. But it is to be noted that these were epochs in the history of the Western Church, and that the Eastern Church did not theorize on grace. It was not so sensitive as the Western Church was to the contrast between sin and grace. That is at any rate how we usually put it; but Dr. Gloubokowsky, who contributes the paper on 'Grace in the Greek Fathers,' puts it differently. He explains that the Greek Fathers did not theorize on grace because the Eastern Christians were continually conscious of the grace of God existing in them. 'They breathed the ether of this Grace, washed themselves in its streams, were completely embraced by it.'

Among the contributors to this volume are

Professor William Manson, Professor William Adams Brown, and Dr. J. Vernon Bartlet. The last paper is a useful 'Statement of the Problems' by Dr. A. C. Headlam, Bishop of Gloucester. He indicates the great diversity of belief that exists among the various Churches, and concludes that 'unity can only come through the recognition that we must be united in the acceptance of Jesus Christ and all that that implies, and must not impose upon others our schemes of salvation.'

THE TEACHING OF JESUS.

In *The Teaching of Jesus*, by Mr. T. W. Manson, M.A. (Cambridge University Press; 15s. net), we have a really valuable contribution to the study of the Gospels. Work of this high quality does not see the light every day, and it deserves the warmest welcome. Every page gives evidence of careful criticism and sound exegesis and, what is better still, a profound insight into the mind of Christ. The book is in two parts. The first contains a fresh and independent study of the sources; the second an equally valuable study of the contents of the teaching. Mr. Manson advances the theory that 'there is not one uniform strain of teaching delivered to all and sundry alike, but that there are three distinct and readily distinguishable streams. Jesus has one way of dealing with the Scribes and Pharisees, another for the multitude, and yet another for his intimate disciples.' He also sees in the Transfiguration and Peter's confession the turning-point or watershed of the Gospel story, after which the teaching of Jesus takes on a new tone. The subject of the Kingdom of God receives specially full and elaborate treatment in its three aspects: first, as 'a personal relation between God as King and the individual as subject'; second, as 'it appears in the world as a society'; and last, as 'the final consummation.' When 'these three interdependent conceptions of the Kingdom as an eternal fact, as a manifestation in the present life of men, and as a consummation still to come,' are rightly apprehended, many of the questions which are diligently canvassed in regard to the manner and time of the coming of the Kingdom settle themselves. The meaning of the much discussed 'Son of Man' is freshly dealt with as a development of the Old Testament doctrine of the Remnant. It may be added that a notable feature of the whole work is the wealth of illustrative matter drawn from the Old Testament and Jewish Literature. Mr. Manson's book should prove a gold mine to the student of the Gospels.

THE AMERICAN TRANSLATION OF
THE BIBLE.

We have received from the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press, a plain but well-bound volume entitled *The Bible: An American Translation* (University of Chicago Press; 20s. net). It comprises two separate publications. The first is 'The Old Testament: An American Translation,' by Alexander R. Gordon, Theophile J. Meek, J. M. Powis Smith, and Leroy Waterman, which appeared about five years ago. The second is 'The New Testament: An American Translation,' by Edgar J. Goodspeed, which appeared eight or nine years ago (and an excerpt from which was recently reviewed in these columns). The two publications are now before us in a single book. The most comparable book published on this side of the Atlantic is Professor James Moffatt's translation of both Testaments. The names of the American translators (we do not forget that the late Professor Gordon was lent by Scotland to America until shortly before his lamented death) are a guarantee of the soundness of the scholarship which they brought to their great task; and we heartily commend this book, which merits the head-line of this review, to ministers, teachers, and others who desire to check the meaning of the English Version of the Bible in the light of a reliable modern translation. This is not to say that this or any other of our modern versions should be 'appointed to be read in churches.' We should add that in this edition of the Old Testament the Appendix is omitted, where are listed the passages in which textual change has been made.

THE ARAMAISMS OF THE FOURTH
GOSPEL.

Mr. Ernest Cadman Colwell in *The Greek of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge University Press; 11s. net) presents a study of the Aramaisms of the Fourth Gospel in the light of Hellenistic Greek. With the object of evaluating as Greek the ever-lengthening list of 'Semitic constructions' in the Greek of that Gospel he has interrogated the non-literary papyri of the Roman period and the 'Discourses' of Epictetus on the constructions involved. He shows that practically all the constructions may be paralleled in classical or Hellenistic Greek, and concludes that the theory of a Semitic original is fundamentally erroneous.

In the beginning of the present century A. Schlatter advanced the opinion that the Gospel

of John was written by one who thought and spoke in Aramaic. Ten years ago the late C. F. Burney offered the most comprehensive argument for an Aramaic original that has yet appeared. At the same time that Burney was working out his theory, James A. Montgomery was independently arriving at a similar conclusion, and soon after the appearance of Burney's work its main argument was endorsed by C. C. Torrey.

The present study is based upon the works of Burney, Montgomery, and Torrey. The method employed is to make a list of the constructions in John which these three writers regarded as Aramaisms, and to look for these same constructions in the papyri and the 'Discourses.' It is the author's opinion that many another parallel besides those listed in his book may be drawn even from the sources that he has studied. But from the limited evidence here adduced he claims to have shown that the author of the Fourth Gospel neither thought in Aramaic nor wrote in Aramaic.

In *Jesus in our Teaching*, by Professor Clarence Tucker Craig (Abingdon Press; \$1.50), the writer has a double aim, 'to state in brief compass the present status of the research about Jesus, and then to provide some suggestions in the practical use of those results.' This aim is excellent, but the brevity of the treatment prevents an adequate handling of either topic. The result is that we have somewhat scrappy discussions of the Synoptic problem, of miracles, etc., leading up to the commonplace liberal portrait of Jesus. Of this emaciated figure it may be said, in a word, that if there were nothing more in Jesus than this the twentieth century would probably never have heard of Him. The closing chapters, dealing with the use of the Gospel story in religious education, are of more value and contain many helpful suggestions.

Americans seem to have a strong penchant for the questionnaire and its statistical fruit. It may be seriously debated whether it is ever much use. But on the other side it is much used and much thought of. The latest example is *The Character Outcome of Present-Day Religion*, by Mr. George H. Betts (Abingdon Press; \$1.25). The author issued to three hundred churchmen (ministers, laymen, directors of religious education, professors, and others) two questions: Do our Churches to-day teach and preach a religion that can effectively influence conduct and character? and If they do,

why is it not working better to that end? The replies are tabulated, and many extracts are given from them on both sides. We confess to being more interested in the second question than in the first. But the replies to it do not reveal anything of great value as a cure for our failure to change people. They are, generally speaking, true but vague. The book as a whole is, however, interesting and deals with a topic that comes home to us.

Mr. F. E. Pollard, M.A., the present Chairman of the Friends' Peace Committee, makes a vigorous plea for reason as a guide to truth in an attractive little volume entitled *Religion, Morals, and the Intellect* (Allen & Unwin; 5s. net). In his discussion 'intellect' signifies 'the mind when functioning as seer and thinker, whether enjoying experiences, framing conceptions, discovering facts and uniformities, inventing and testing hypotheses, seeing visions or arriving at moral judgments. It is the power which collects and classifies phenomena, gives form and system to the medley of impressions, constructs purposes and weighs values.' Clearly it is no narrow intellectualism for which the author stands, and the services for which he looks to the intellect are manifold as life itself. In particular he singles out the defence of a truly spiritual religion, the development of a true psychology, the promotion of belief in the unseen world, and the rehabilitation of morality.

The book is the fruit of much careful reading and penetrative thinking, and contains many shrewd criticisms of present-day religion and morals. But it fails as a whole to present a clear message. The author has tried to pack too much into his pages, and the result is *dissecta membra* and 'scattered threads' rather than a vital or patterned unity. We like him best when he deals with education and ethical problems.

Not Indian pastors only, for whom the book is primarily written, but Biblical students in this country as well, will be helped to a clearer notion of what the Exile was and what it meant for the development of Jewish religious thought and practice by Canon Sell's admirable little book on *The Exile* (Church Missionary Society; 1s. 3d. net), which is quite worthy to be set alongside the late Professor A. B. Davidson's primer on 'The Exile and the Restoration.' After gathering together the historical facts, he discusses the allusions and the teaching of Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Deutero-Isaiah, showing everywhere an easy mastery of

the material, and concluding with a valuable chapter on The Lessons of the Exile, in which he deals more particularly with the conception of God, individualism, and the synagogue. The value of the book is enhanced by the use the writer makes of certain books of the Apocrypha. As an illustration of the insight with which the subject is treated, the following sentence may be quoted: 'Ezekiel's doctrine of the transcendence was balanced by Jeremiah who dwelt on the nearness of God, and by Deutero-Isaiah's statements about God's active participation in the world's affairs.' The value of Canon Sell's work is so highly appreciated in the East that several of his commentaries on the Old Testament have been translated into five Oriental languages.

Studies on the Apostles' Creed (James Clarke; 6s. net), by the Rev. John Burr, M.A., H.C.F., is a series of homiletical rather than critical addresses in which the various clauses of the Apostles' Creed are treated *seriatim*. In explaining their meaning and enforcing the truths which they contain the author makes good illustrative use of incident and quotation. The exposition is 'solid and devout,' as Professor H. R. Mackintosh remarks in the Foreword, the standpoint is theologically conservative (though in cosmology frankly in line with modern views), and the work as a whole is the fruit of much patient and loving study.

The Counter-Reformation in Scotland, by Professor Donald Maclean, D.D. (James Clarke; 7s. 6d. net), gives a detailed and very readable account of the activities of the Church of Rome in Scotland from 1560 to the present day. It may be doubted whether a minute record of some of these obscure and fantastic plots which came to nothing will be of much interest to the general reader. Still Dr. Maclean has done a serviceable piece of work in putting the narrative together so as to make the material readily accessible. The latter chapters also are fitted to awaken readers to the fact that there is a real peril to Protestantism in Scotland to-day from the activities of Rome supported by Irish immigration.

Volume IV. of the *Woodbrooke Studies*, which embodies the work of Baršalibi against the Armenians, has just been published by Heffer, Cambridge, at the incredibly low price of 5s. net. It consists of the Syriac text, beautifully reproduced, with brief introduction and a delightfully readable translation from the pen of that brilliant

Orientalist, Dr. Mingana. The work is Baršalibi's exposition and refutation of thirty-five uncanonical customs and habits of the Armenians. Many of these are trivial enough, others are more serious, and the way in which Baršalibi (who died in A.D. 1171) deals with them is often astonishingly modern, his arguments being inspired alike by sound Christian instinct and common sense. As against the Docetic heresy with which the Armenians seem to have been tainted, Baršalibi argues that Christ was truly circumcised, truly ate and drank whenever He wished, and did everything like us apart from sin. In attacking the Armenian practice of forbidding laymen to read the gospel, he argues thus cogently: 'Tell us where you learned this. It is indeed not suitable for laymen to read publicly the gospel for the congregation, as a priest does; but if a believer reads it for himself and takes benefit from it, why do you deprive him of such a grace?' He refutes the sacrificial practices of Armenia by quotations from the Prophets, the Psalms, and the Epistles (Mic 6⁷, Jer 6²⁰, Is 66³, Ps 50¹³ 51¹⁶, 1 Co 5⁷, He 9²⁶¹), and declares, 'It would be good on our part if we taught them that even under the old law sacrifices were not acceptable,' and 'if sacrifices were rejected under the old Law, how much more are they so in the New Testament?' Against the Armenian objection to frequent Communion on the ground of unworthiness, he argues, 'If you are not worthy of it to-day, show us when you will be.' These extracts will show that the work is a real addition to our knowledge of early Christian controversies.

Mr. Arthur Mee, whose ingenious and fertile mind is always devising novelties, has compiled a little book of the sayings of Jesus under the title of *Jesus Said* (Hodder & Stoughton; 2s. 6d. net). In a brief introduction he includes the sayings found in the Oxyrhynchus fragment. A full index is supplied at the end, so that the claim is made good that 'every word that Jesus spoke is found instantly.' By what seems a strange omission, however, while the Gospel in which each of the sayings is to be found is given, there is no reference to chapter and verse, so that any one wishing to see the context of the saying would have little guidance. If, as seems likely, this little book should prove popular, it might be well to supply this omission.

Temples of Eternity, by Mr. R. H. J. Steuart, S.J. (Longmans; 5s. net), contains a series of essays on the spiritual life. 'To be fitting Temples, to be

ever more and more truly His own place, is the problem of our lives'—that is the burden of the book, which is always serious and uplifting, and sometimes beautiful in its spiritual simplicity. The Beatific Vision, Life more Abundant, Hid with Christ in God—these three titles will perhaps indicate something of what the reader may expect. It is a good specimen of the Roman Catholic devotional literature.

The Clarendon Bible moves steadily on. The fifth volume, which deals with *Judaism in the Greek Period* (Milford; 4s. 6d. net), has just appeared. It is from the very competent hands of the Rev. G. H. Box, M.A., D.D., who has contributed so often and so fruitfully to the interpretation of Judaism. The period covered is the Hellenistic Age, from the rise of Alexander the Great to the intervention of Rome (333–63 B.C.), the period which saw the birth of the Septuagint and the assault upon Judaism which issued in the Maccabean wars—a period which, alike through its life and its literature, exercised a profound influence on the Christian Church. Dr. Box introduces his discussion of selected passages by a vivid sketch of the historical background in which the characters of Alexander the Great and Antiochus Epiphanes are drawn with a sure hand, and the political issues of that tangled time are clearly set forth. The literature—prophetic, apocalyptic, and wisdom literature—is then discussed in selections drawn from the Old Testament and the Apocrypha. The Old Testament selections are from Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon, Joel, Jonah, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah, while the Apocrypha is represented by Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, and 1 Maccabees. The passages are usually brief, but highly significant, and their significance is expounded in helpful notes. It is interesting to note that Dr. Box, though he does not quite commit himself, seems to lean to the view that the Book of Habakkuk belongs to the fourth century B.C., and reflects the problems raised by the conquests of Alexander the Greek. There are over forty admirable illustrations, of scenery, cities, synagogues, etc., which enhance the interest of Dr. Box's absorbing narrative and exposition.

After mastering the grammatical and syntactical rudiments, the best way to learn a language which one has no opportunity of hearing is by reading some original composition in the language alongside of a first-rate translation, which is literal enough to encourage the tyro and yet idiomatic

enough to compel him to do some thinking for himself. These conditions are ideally met by the Rev. Joseph Rabinowitz's *Mishnah Megillah* (Milford; 10s. 6d. net). Text and translation face each other on opposite pages, and there are admirable notes which carefully consider the linguistic phenomena as well as the contents. Students of Biblical Hebrew will be interested to watch the later development of familiar words—how לקח, for example, comes to mean 'to purchase,' and יצא 'to do one's duty' (abbreviated from יצא מירי חובו 'to be quit of one's debt'). Few Biblical students are at home in Mishnaic Hebrew, and we could not imagine a better introduction to it than this. The contents of this particular book will doubtless be much more interesting to Jewish than to Christian students: it deals with the laws regulating the writing of the Scroll of Esther and the reading of it in public worship. A careful introduction discusses the sources and date of the tractate, the time and manner of the reading of the Megillah, the persons qualified to read it, its bearing upon the history of the liturgy of the Synagogue, the rites and customs connected with the observance of Purim, etc. Mastery of this tractate on its linguistic side, which Dr. Rabinowitz's translation and notes have greatly facilitated, will enable the Christian student to move with relative ease and freedom through other Jewish material of a more congenial kind.

Dr. George V. Jourdan, who has already in his work on 'The Movement towards Catholic Reform in the Early Sixteenth Century' shown competent knowledge of the period of the Renaissance, continues his work in that field by the publication of a series of admirable essays, *The Siress of Change* (Robert Scott; 9s. net). They deal with some of the great figures in English history, Wolsey, More, and Fisher, with Lefèvre and some of the later Humanists, with Copernicus and the intriguing personality of Paracelsus, and the curious episode of Prince Djem. Dr. Jourdan has gone to the *fontes*, and he has the gift of presenting his material with great skill and attractiveness. His work is warmly commended in a foreword by Professor Whitney of Cambridge.

To understand and expound a book like the Revelation of St. John it is perhaps necessary to be at the same time a scholar and a mystic. These two qualifications are united in the writer of the

latest book on the Apocalypse: *Mystical Studies in the Apocalypse*, by the Very Rev. H. Erskine Hill, D.D., Provost of St. Andrew's Cathedral, Aberdeen (Stock; 7s. 6d. net). In our 'Notes of Recent Exposition' we have given an account of the general view behind the exposition. And it may be sufficient to say here that to Dr. Hill the Apocalypse was not meant to be an obscure and cryptic narration of concrete earthly events, but is an intelligible whole, embodying a progressive revelation deliberately given by our Lord through the agency of angelic beings in a series of visions impressed on the inner consciousness of the seer. The purpose of the Apocalypse was to give the Church a vision of the world and earthly life as they see them whose consciousness is centred in the Spiritual and Eternal. In other words, it is a view of world events from the Divine side. This standpoint is expressed in several essays, and is applied in detail to a number of the visions in the Apocalypse itself. It may be said that the book is deeply interesting and impressive, and that it is written by one who is not a fanatic but a competent and scholarly clergyman.

The Story of the Universe, by Mr. Victor Greatheart (Stockwell; 2s. 6d. net), is apparently intended to be a reconciliation of the Bible and evolution, but the writer seems to regard everything in heaven and earth as coming within his ambit. So we have rambling disquisitions on a variety of subjects from ocean liners to picture post-cards, mingled with earnest appeals to Cabinet Ministers, strike-leaders, flappers, atheists, and blasphemers. Through all this medley there runs a thread of popular astronomy.

Messrs. Williams & Norgate have published a series of *Letters to John Bull and Others* by an anonymous writer who calls himself 'Robert eht Peeler,' strongly advocating universal disarmament and an agreed settlement of war debts (3s. 6d. net). These Letters are addressed chiefly to the people of this country, but also to the peoples of Germany, the United States, France, Italy, and Japan. They are dated in June and July last, and that they are already out of date is admitted in the postscript to the Letter to Japan on her action in Manchuria. They are all able statements of the writer's point of view, but a great deal more than the argument of an anonymous writer is demanded in the advocacy of a settlement of this great international problem.

National Contributions to Biblical Science.

XVI. America's Contribution to Church History.

By PROFESSOR F. J. FOAKES JACKSON, D.D., NEW YORK.

THE work of Church historians in the United States has been prolific; for, if there are comparatively few men of outstanding merit in the field of early, as distinguished from apostolic, and general Church history, in one branch, that of Christianity in America, there is much of exceptional interest. America has been, in fact, the scene of the making of some modern religions, and of some varieties of Christianity, such as Mormonism and Christian Science. These recall those aberrations of primitive Christianity represented by some of the Gnostic sects. The story of missions, and what we may call pioneer Christianity in frontier settlements, is here and there absolutely thrilling. Of great interest also is the tale of how the older religious bodies of Europe developed and adapted themselves to fresh conditions on a new continent.

Comparatively little has been contributed to our knowledge of early Church history. There is the valuable project of that indefatigable worker, Philip Schaff, late Professor of Church History in the Union Theological Seminary of New York. The 'Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers' first appeared under Schaff's editorship, and for the second series he secured the co-operation of Dr. Wace, Dean of Canterbury. One of the most outstanding contributions of these useful translations is *Eusebius of Cæsarea*, by Dr. A. C. McGiffert, the successor in Schaff's chair. This invaluable work was done before the author had completed his twenty-ninth year. In his old age this dean of American Church historians is engaged on an eagerly expected *History of Christian Thought*.

In the field of medieval history one American has supplied an invaluable contribution of absorbing interest to the reader, and a perfect mine of information for the investigator. The work Dr. Henry Charles Lea has done on the Inquisition, Clerical Celibacy, Auricular Confession, etc., is truly monumental. A considerable impulse in the direction of interest in the Middle Ages has been given by the publication of Henry Adams' *Mont Saint Michel and Chartres*, though this interesting volume can hardly be described as an history. Architecture is the art in which America has achieved much conspicuous success; and Adams has indicated the way in which one of the most beautiful cathedrals in France

can be, as it were, a contemporary document of the highest value illustrating the history and reflecting the thought of one of the great centuries of human endeavour. We are able to read in stone and glass the story of those generations which witnessed the career of the poor man of Assisi, and the romantic adventures of the sainted warrior king of France. The result is seen in the erection of churches of a Gothic type in America, the expression of the view that the thirteenth century gave utterance to the best Christian ideals, and that it was the age of the realization of truth, beauty, and love in religion. These ideas have been fostered greatly by the genius of Ralph Adams Cram; and find expression, not only in those churches, the traditions of which are rooted in the Middle Ages, but also in others which go back only to the Reformation. Most notable of examples of Protestant Gothic erections is the magnificent edifice on Riverside Drive in New York, in which the oleaginous wealth of American enterprise has expressed itself in a building which endeavours to reproduce the conceptions of the long-neglected past of the simple piety of feudal Europe. There is a reaction in favour of medieval study, as is seen in the establishment of flourishing societies to further it, and magazines like the *Speculum*, established in Boston, for the discussion of its various aspects. Up to the present the interest in the Middle Ages has expressed itself rather in numerous monographs than in a comprehensive history of all, or part, of the period.

The fact is, the American mind is not, as a rule, interested in the past, and there is a certain reluctance to believe that its experience has anything to teach the present. The story of Israel and of the first days of Christianity have an interest as fundamental to our religion; but the fascinating, though occasionally tedious, record of the rise and progress of the Christian Church is regarded with impatience as dealing with a phase of human history with which the man of to-day has but little concern. A conspicuous example of the slight interest in Church History in its wider sense is seen in a recent attempt to give the American public an idea of the progress of Christianity from the earliest time to the present day, called *Outlines of Christianity*. Two volumes

out of the five are professedly historical. The whole book which, I think, has met with less success than it deserved, was projected in America, and was directed by various boards in New York. The second volume is devoted to the story of the Church from the post-apostolic age to the eve of the Reformation, and an attempt has been made to sketch the chief events in chronological order. Of the forty-seven chapters, only six were written by Americans. In the third volume, edited by a distinguished American professor, who contributed sixteen explanatory chapters, nine of the remaining twenty-four were not by native historians. Nor are the schools in the churches and seminaries strong in the department of Church History, one reason being that a professor in this subject is often expected to include every period in his courses. This is the more to be deplored as the Divinity Faculties in such Universities as Yale, Harvard, Princeton, and Chicago are excellent. Harvard, however, to my personal knowledge, has at present two brilliant men in Professors Lake and La Piana, both being foreigners. Lake's predecessor in the Winn Chair, Ephraim Emerton, now emeritus professor, has done some excellent work in medieval history. The Union Theological Seminary of New York has two Scotsmen—Moffatt and E. F. Scott—of real historical ability; and the librarian, Dr. Rockwell, distinguished in palæography, as a bibliographer is a worthy pupil of Dr. McGiffert. The Professor of Church History in the General Theological Seminary of New York, Dr. Gavin, of whom much may be hoped, has the linguistic power which is so necessary to an historian, and is a real authority on the Churches of the East. Dr. Robert Casey, now teaching in the University of Cincinnati, though a very young man, promises (as an editor of St. Athanasius) to do credit to Harvard and Jesus College, Cambridge, in England, where he was trained. Lest I should be thought invidious in my selection, I may say at once that I have confined myself to those whom I know personally. I may add the writer of a book which greatly interested me, A. V. G. Allen, of the Cambridge Divinity School, Mass., whose *Continuity of Christian Thought* appeared in 1884.

American Church History deserves careful attention by British students, but the literature is largely denominational and possesses comparatively little literary grace. I have before me a formidable list of 'Writers of Church History of the U.S.'; but, as it would be to those who happen to read this paper little more than a catalogue of names, I think it best merely to state the topics which are

of special interest to me. The great centre of Church movement was New England, and especially the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. I have before me *The Religious History of New England* (1917), a series of lectures delivered by eight well-known men in the King's Chapel, at Boston. The episodes in the Churches are many and startling—The Theocracy, the Salem Witch Trials, the Foundation of the Colony of Rhode Island, the troubles of the Episcopalians during and after the Revolution should deserve the attention of British historical students.

The story of New England piety is fertile of great names—John Cotton, the two Mathers, Roger Williams, Anne Hutchinson, Jonathan Edwards, Channing, Parker, Emerson, Seabury, Phillips Brooks—names which all have heard and with which few can connect with many facts. Very different is that of the older colony of Virginia. New England was the home of a vigorous intellectual Protestantism, displaying itself in many curious forms. The religion of Virginia was originally a decorous Anglicanism. The planters in the district, known as the 'Tidewater,' went to church, incidentally to pray, but also to meet their neighbours and to discuss sport, the crops, and the news of the day, as became a prosperous gentry. The clergy were not unlike their brethren, the beneficed clergymen of eighteenth-century England. The easy, tolerant, and not over spiritual rule of the landed aristocracy and their Church was disturbed by the more insistent piety of the ruder settlers up country. The Presbyterians led the way; the followers of Wesley made Methodism; revivalist orations drew the masses, as the somnolent preaching of the establishment—for the Church of England was recognized and endowed—had failed to do. The vitality of this accession of piety was seen in the foundation of sectarian churches and in the establishment of schools and colleges. All this is told in a book issued from the Duke University Press, by Wesley M. Gewehr, called *The Great Awakening in Virginia* (1930).

The history of the Roman Catholics who, in 1785, numbered 25,000 in the United States, and have now almost touched the twenty million mark, has yet to be told. According to a book entitled *Church Historians*, with foreword and index by Peter Guilday, Ph.D. (1926), it is admitted that both an English and a German historiographer have only listed one American name 'among those who have forwarded the general study of Catholic Church history.' Yet, as the great *Catholic Encyclopedia* which emanated from New York shows, there

are many in the Roman Church interested in its history.

But one more branch of American Church history deserves attention, namely, the unorthodox manifestation of Christianity, or of Paganism fostered in a Christian environment. In a most interesting book, *The Confusion of Tongues* (1928), Charles W. Ferguson has sketched several of these peculiar aberrations of the American intellect. His account of Mormonism should be studied, as it is a religion of purely native growth, with an originality of its own. Those who desire to wander in this labyrinth of strange doctrine could not do better than to start with Mr. Ferguson's volume. Here two features deserve attention. One is the extraordinary influence of women in the foundation of these strange sects. Ann Lea took Shakerism from England to the United States in 1774. Mary Baker Eddy made Christian Science a most wealthy and powerful society, and Mrs. Aimée Semple Macpherson has now votaries which pay her almost

divine honours. A similar phenomenon is found in the history of Early Gnosticism. The power of advertisement has been manifested most strikingly in American sectarianism, and its influence demonstrated in pushing a strange doctrine as well as in forcing some patent medicine on a credulous public. There is indeed an element in the heterogeneous composition of American Society as crude and orgiastic as appeared in the Christianity of the Roman Empire, and in the strangest excesses of medieval and early Reformation movements.

I had intended in this paper to explain the debt we owe to American Church historians; but I have allowed my pen to run away with me, and it has carried me on to try and explain the interest and importance of the study of religious history in the United States. For this I owe my readers an apology, as I should perhaps have given them a bibliography of Church history which would be serviceable. But I have at least opened the way to a field of study, not unworthy of cultivation.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Plus and Minus.

BY THE REVEREND H. L. PICKEN, NEWARK.

'I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me.'—Gal 2²⁰.

THERE'S one letter in the alphabet that gets used a great deal more than any other. I wonder if you can guess what it is? Yes, it's the letter 'I.'

You hear it such a lot when some people are talking: 'I did this—I did that—I think—I say—I do—I am—I was—I shall.' Their talk is all about I, that is SELF. Now folk who are always talking and thinking about themselves are not very pleasant to know. They are what we call selfish, and there's nothing so horrid and ugly as selfishness. We feel there is something WRONG when a person is selfish.

Now, what do you do if you make a mistake and write a wrong letter or wrong figure at school? You just draw a line through it, don't you? 'That cancels it,' we say. Well, supposing we do this with this letter 'I' that we use such a lot. Put a stroke through it. See, what has happened? Why it has made a cross, so +. A CROSS—that reminds us of the Lord Jesus, doesn't it, because He gave

Himself up to die on a cross? And because Jesus died on a cross, the Cross stands for SELF-SACRIFICE, giving up self for others—CANCELLING OUT 'I.' And the people who cancel out 'I's' are those most like Jesus. You can't cancel out 'I' without making a cross, and crosses are not pleasant or easy to bear. But Jesus said, 'If any one will come after me, let him take up his cross daily.' That means cancelling out 'I' every day of our lives, and living to please and serve others.

Look at this cross again, +. Tell me, all you boys and girls who know arithmetic, what sign is it? A PLUS SIGN of course, you say. It means something added. It's the sign of ADDITION. Well, THE CROSS IS GOD'S PLUS SIGN. But the Cross means SELF-SACRIFICE, giving up self for others. That sounds more like SUBTRACTION than ADDITION, doesn't it? And the sign for subtracting, for taking away, is a MINUS SIGN! That is so, and yet the Cross is God's PLUS SIGN, because whenever we forget self, and give up trying to please ourselves, and think of and please others instead, we are always ADDING, not TAKING AWAY. We are always richer, not poorer—happier, not sadder. Something has been added to us, not taken away. You

try it and see if it isn't so. So soon as I begin to think of others, 'I' becomes 'we.'

Then, too, the Cross is God's plus sign because it means that on the Cross MAN IS ADDED TO GOD. Jesus died on the Cross to bring man to God by showing men how much God loves them. SIN and wrong is the big MINUS SIGN of the world that takes man away from God. The Cross is the great PLUS SIGN that cancels out Sin, and adds God and Man together.

When you have done a wrong, something against mother's wishes, you know how miserable you have felt? It has seemed as though you had lost something of your mother, the sense of her love and pleasure in you. When we sin, we feel the same about God, our Father. It takes away the sense of God's love and makes us feel we have lost Him.

An Easter Sermon.

BY THE REVEREND S. GREER, M.A., AYR.

'I am the resurrection, and the life.'—Jn 11²⁵.

What was it? Tommy had found it in the garden, a dry wizened root, like an onion. 'Throw it away,' said his sister, who didn't like grubby things. 'No,' said Dad; 'put it into this pot with some clay, and let's see what it really is.' That was months ago, and they'd forgotten all about it, till one day last week they came upon that pot, and in it a lovely hyacinth, its white bells all fully open, fragrant with the most delicate perfume.

For you know how everything has been stirring in the spring sunshine. You've felt it yourself. So have the blackbirds and the thrushes, singing as though they would burst their little throats for very joy. So did the little shy crocuses in their pretty dresses of mauve and saffron and white. All the long winter they had been sleeping; then something in them began to stir at the touch of the soft winds, and they awoke.

It is Easter! Isn't it good to know that Jesus rose from the grave on a spring morning? In the garden where they had laid Him, there would be flowers blossoming everywhere, and birds would be whistling from every tree-top, just as if everything was rejoicing that He and they and all that is lovely and good and true can never really perish. They may seem to die, and we may be very sad about it, as Jesus' friends were when they laid Him in the grave. But it is only seeming. In reality our loved ones who have passed from our sight have but fallen asleep; and often when we're mourning for them, they are already walking

in the joyous sunshine of the Resurrection morning. 'I am the resurrection and the life,' He says.

That's why Easter is such a gladsome time. Millions of Christians of the Greek Church when they meet this morning will greet one another with the happy salutation, 'He is risen!' and bells that for weeks have been silent will be ringing out in joyful peals. We in our country give presents to one another. How many Easter eggs did you get? A funny idea making gifts of eggs, isn't it? But not so strange when you remember the wee chick that comes out of an egg, with its sharp little beak breaking its way into life. Always the idea of 'life,' you see, when we celebrate Easter. Life! The life that shines in the eyes of those we love, that throbs in the mind of the thinker, that thrills in the voice of the bird, that riots in the flaming colours of your garden, that flits in the gaudy beauty of the butterfly, and gambols in the frolics of the lambs—life cannot be destroyed. It may sleep, but 'I shall wake again,' it cries.

To return to Tommy's 'onion,' as we disrespectfully called it; you could never have told what it really was by looking at it. I wonder what *you* really are. You've been called many names you never got at baptism: 'chatterbox,' and all the rest. And, of course, there are a great many 'you's' in each one of you. There's the 'you' that Dad knows, and the 'you' that your school-chum knows, and the 'you' your teacher knows; all of them different—may they never meet! But there's another 'you.' They said of Michael Angelo that, where others saw only a block of marble, he saw the figure of the angel he could make out of it. That's something like what Jesus sees in us. He sees the 'you' He wants you to be, and which in your best moments you want to be, and He helps you to be it. For He is 'Life,' and He radiates life.

His is the power which, unloosed on the first Easter morning, so changed the lives of men and women that they did not know themselves and one another. 'Yes,' they explained, 'you're perfectly right: it *isn't me*—it's Christ that's living in me.' He can take the crookedest life and make it go straight. He can help a fellow to be a 'white man,' and bring his passions to heel. For He is living, and He is the life-giver. In Him we become gloriously alive. It is natural to be a Christian: it is life at its best. Jesus is strength in our souls, and power to walk in the way of honour; comradeship in the difficult passages of life, and victory to the end. He is 'LIFE.'

The Christian Year.

SIXTH SUNDAY IN LENT.

The Suffering of God.

'In all their affliction he was afflicted.'—Is 63^o.

'Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows.'—Is 53^d.

Sorrow belongs to the very nature of love, so long, at least, as the ends which love seeks are not perfectly realized. If love reigned fully in our hearts, so that there was no sin or selfishness anywhere, perhaps there would be no sorrow, but only 'joy in widest commonalty spread.' But how far away we are from that ideal! What are the ends which love seeks? It seeks the highest welfare of others. The test of the quality of the mother's love is its endurance and the range of its self-sacrifice. The strongest thing on earth, love is also one of the most tender and delicate:

Love, like an Alpine harebell hung with tears
By some cold morning glacier.

Now, if pain of necessity enters into human love, and if human love is a reflection of the love of God, must not God feel pain? Can He be really a Father if His heart is not sympathetically moved by the sorrows and miseries of the lives of His children?

What *grounds* have we for saying that God feels sorrow?

There is, in the first place, the fact of sin. Human sin must mean something to God. He cannot be indifferent to it, if His purpose is a redemptive purpose; but must react against it with the whole force of His Being. Is that reaction only one of hatred or repulsion? Has it not a tenderer side? May we not say that our sins hurt His heart of love? God, we believe, is ready to forgive the repentant sinner. But real forgiveness costs something. It is no mechanical operation, but is the movement of one personality toward another, a movement in which love covers up an earlier hurt at the cost of self-sacrifice. Sin is something more than the violation of a moral order. It is an offence against a Person; and that Person Jesus Christ has revealed as a Father. We too often think very lightly of sin, make excuses for it and treat it as a weakness which may be condoned. But the true estimate of it will only be found when we set it in relation to the character of God and His purpose for us.

Secondly, our strongest ground for saying that God suffers with His world lies in the Cross of Jesus Christ. We must not separate the death of

Jesus from His life. His whole life was one of self-giving for men; the Cross was the supreme instance of that self-giving. In it the principle of the life came to full maturity. On Calvary we see to what lengths the love of God was prepared to go in the prosecution of its redemptive purpose.

The wonder of the Cross; how amazing it is! When God seeks to redeem men, when the Father wants to bring home to His children the real nature of His love for them, what does He do? He comes Himself in the Person of His Son to die for them upon a Cross. He enters into the full range of their experience, undergoes the worst which life has to offer, loneliness, desertion by friends, the scorn and hatred of malicious opponents, bodily suffering, mental anguish, a cruel death. Of these far the worst was the mental anguish, the anguish of a pure soul faced with the real significance of human guilt. Here was Divine love, revealing not only its own nature, but the nature of sin. Here was God wrestling with sin, exposing it in its true character, showing what it cost to deal with it effectively. And love's method of dealing with it is the only method by which it can finally be abolished.

Centuries before it was given to an Old Testament prophet to see a vision of this way of redemption by the self-sacrifice of love. The writer, whom we call Second Isaiah, writing on the eve of the return of the Jews from exile, draws a picture of the Suffering Servant who is to redeem His people. Israel had not fulfilled its vocation; it had been disloyal to God. Punishment had fallen on it. But now God in His love, and true to His promise, was about to restore the nation again to their native land. The prophet longs to see the restored nation loyal to God, and not only walking in the light itself, but spreading that light among other nations. He sees that this can be accomplished only if the faithful few, the nucleus of the nation, are ready at all costs to be true to God. They will be laughed at by their fellows, persecuted and maltreated. Only let them be loyal, and their fidelity will act as a leaven which will gradually leaven the whole lump. Sometimes the prophet gives the name 'servant' to the whole nation; more often only to the faithful nucleus. He personifies this nucleus; we see a single figure faced with the difficult task of being the saviour of his people. In language of melting beauty and pathos he describes the Suffering Servant. 'His visage was so marred more than any man, and his form more than the sons of men. . . . He was despised, and rejected of men; a man of sorrows,

and acquainted with grief.' See Him at His redemptive task. Men scorn Him; refuse to believe that this is the looked-for redeemer. This is one 'stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted,' suffering, perhaps for some wrong-doing, the heavy chastisement of God's hand. They insult Him, but He bears it all patiently. No murmur escapes His lips; He has no reproach for His tormentors. Finally they kill Him. But the hour of His defeat was the hour of His triumph. The deed was done; but then came the pause, when passion had died down, and reflection could do its work, and hard hearts were open once again to the promptings of God's Spirit. What had they gained by their deed? Him they had silenced; but His words lived on in memory, and they were haunted by the vision of that sad face, that calm and patient Sufferer. Gradually the truth dawned on them, the truth which God had all along been wanting to teach them, that this was in very truth their Redeemer. This was God's way of showing how He loved them, and wanted to help them. They see it all now, and the confession breaks from their lips, 'Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows. . . .'

To this Old Testament picture of the method of redeeming love the New Testament adds a fresh touch, which makes the marvel all the greater. It shows us God Himself as the Suffering Servant. Not through another, not by a selected messenger, did God reveal the depths of His love for men. But He came Himself in Jesus Christ to redeem men through suffering and death. In the mind of the prophet the Servant may have stood for the faithful nucleus of Israel; but what Christian is there who, reading this prophecy in the light of the fulfilment it received on Calvary, will not feel that there was a deeper significance in the prophet's words than he himself knew. He had no vision of Jesus Christ, but through him God was giving to the world a glimpse of that fuller revelation which was to come later. Behind the picture of the Servant, like a portrait upon which another is superimposed, we trace the outlines of a figure which was to be fully disclosed in God's own good time.

We think, then, of God as working out His purpose at the cost of infinite pain, of His love moving to its final victory through sorrow. For ourselves and our own lives the thought has a twofold significance. In the first place, it is a thought which should shame us, when we reflect that part of that sorrow is caused by ourselves. The Greek word for sin in the New Testament signifies literally 'a missing of the mark.' We miss

the mark; the arrow turns aside and wounds God. In *The Sorrows of Satan*, Marie Corelli depicts Satan as longing to be good, but hindered by the sinning of man. Satan is kept evil by human wrong-doing. And that same wrong-doing keeps God sad. Is not it the basest ingratitude to turn thus against a love which only seeks to bless us, and is ready to forgive all the past? But, secondly, the thought that suffering is part of the life of God helps and consoles us when we are called on to suffer. 'Beloved,' says St. Peter, 'think it not strange concerning the fiery trial among you, which cometh upon you to prove you, as though a strange thing happened unto you: but inasmuch as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings, rejoice. The Christian links his own sufferings with the sufferings of Christ. He presses through his pain closer to the heart of God, accepts it as part of the world's burden which God shares, and is content to trust when he cannot understand. And his trust leads him to treat his sufferings as a Divine discipline. 'God has a blessing for me wrapped up in this trouble. It is meant to teach me something.' St. Paul has told us how he prayed that God would take away from him his 'thorn in the flesh.' But his prayer was not granted. Instead, there was given him a new revelation of the Divine presence.¹

EASTER DAY.

The Risen Life.

'If by any means I may attain unto the resurrection from the dead.'—Ph 3¹¹ (R.V.).

This is a remarkable saying. It gives expression to a desire—to a hope—which, if possible of fulfilment, must be reckoned one of the most glorious experiences of life. Human hope is among the limitless powers of the world. It seems sometimes to be extravagant, wild, unreasonable—a hoping in face of the impossible. Yet the greatness of man may be measured by this very thing—by the prodigality of his desires, by the splendour of his hopes, by the almost recklessness of his aspirations—and Christian faith and confidence and conviction step in and confirm him in his audacity.

1. We have got into the disastrous habit of thinking of resurrection as a remote event. When the lamp of life has been extinguished and our place here knows us no more—then is the opportunity for the soul to prove the reality of its hopes and desires! By thinking of resurrection as a

¹ V. F. Storr, *The Living God*, 138.

far-away experience, by reserving it as something to be realized by and by in a dim, mysterious, impalpable future, we are missing one of the richest consolations and one of the greatest reinforcements possible to us. The extraordinary thing about St. Paul's view of resurrection is that he regards it as a present truth. He says it may be attained now. Not fully attained; but it may be begun here, it may be entered upon now, it may gather its initial force to-day, and it may go on accumulating power and impetus throughout the advancing years of life, until to break through the dark veil of death into the light beyond will seem to be the most natural and inevitable thing in the world. If true, this is a great doctrine. St. Paul does not offer this as a speculation; he proclaims it as a fact. The question for this man was not whether there is another life after this, but whether he had the power and the inspiration of the other life in this life. To that question he answers with an emphatic Yes. He knows it, he feels it; his whole tone of thought reveals it, his whole method of life demonstrates it; in his view the risen life is an attainment—a process which any man may begin to-day.

2. The hope of a Christian man is richer than any other, because the Light he knows is the Light of the World. We cannot conceive of that Light being put out. There are some things which we feel ought not to die. The mere suggestion that certain things can die, in the sense of becoming extinct, is not only revolting but impossible to all sane and wholesome thought. What are the things that give most significance to life? Love, tenderness, compassion, insight, the sense of duty, strength and beauty of character, uplifting and inspiring thought, moral sympathy, spiritual purity, belief in God, the service of man—these are the marks by which we know that a great soul has been amongst us. If it be possible for these things to be annihilated, life has no meaning, the universe has deceived us, our highest intuitions have misled us, and we are simply stumbling headlong into chaos and night. Where have we seen the perfection of these qualities? Is it not in Jesus Christ? 'We beheld his glory,' says the Apostle John. What was the glory of Jesus? Was it not His character? Thinking of that glory—remembering that character—recalling the wonder of that forgiving, reinstating love—brooding over the unspeakable impressiveness of that holy, unselfish life, Peter (whose heart had been broken and healed again by the tender pity and gracious hope of Jesus) says, 'It was not possible that he should be holden of death.'

How does Paul propose to attain to the resurrection from the dead? He proposes to do it by uniting himself with that which cannot die. What is that? The power of Christ. To Paul's mind resurrection is union with Christ, perfect fellowship with Him, an ever-deepening intimacy with the Divine. This is mystical, but it is real. Paul proves its reality by the quality of his own character, by the constancy of his service, by the endurance of his sufferings, by the continuity of his discipline. He proves it again in the method by which he endeavours to attain his desire. He says plainly it is something to be learned in the common duties and conditions of life; he says clearly it is a process; he frankly admits that he himself has not yet consummated his hope, he has not achieved the perfect life which he so ardently desires; all he claims so far as he is concerned is that he has begun this risen life, and he is constantly pressing on. There is modesty in this, and there is reality too. Those bold persons who sometimes venture to claim perfection must not fear a very practical test; if a man makes such a claim he ought not to forget that the matter can be very easily settled by a reference to his wife and children and next-door neighbour. Paul recognizes, as every honest man must do, that it is a hard world to love and serve God in, that unless a man is very watchful and careful the sin he desires to overcome may easily revive and reassert its mastery. This is not distrust of God; it is an honest man's distrust of himself. How strange it is that when a young man says he wants to 'see life,' he so often gravitates towards things that mean the death of all that is good and true and fair! We only really see life—real life—when we unite ourselves with those influences and forces that help us to rise in the scale of character. 'For the world passeth away, and the lust thereof, but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever.' It is the same doctrine—the endurance of character, the deathlessness of love. Nothing else lasts. Love may be stretched on the Cross; but the pain cannot stifle it. It may be buried in the tomb; but the grave cannot imprison it. It is not possible to kill the principle of Being. That is the incredible thought—the inconceivable imagination. 'It is not possible that he should be holden of death.'¹

If Jesus died,
Nought but the winter and the gloom remain.
But Jesus lives!

¹ W. A. Mursell, *Sermons on Special Occasions*, 39.

Then full and fain,
 Laugh and sing, ye golden flowers,
 Drifting clouds and dancing showers,
 Silver moons that wax and wane,
 Christ is risen ! Christ is risen !
 God's green spring is true again.

FIRST SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

Faith, our Defence against the Past.

'The God of Israel will be your rereward.'—Is 52¹².

1. These words were spoken in the name of God to the Jews who were in exile in Babylon. After many a disappointment, God, working through the large events of history, had made it possible for His people to return from Babylon to their own country. He had summoned Cyrus as His instrument in their liberation—Cyrus who after taking Babylon issued an edict allowing all exiles to return to their various homes. He may have taken this step out of mere prudence, to get rid of the combustible material in this city which he had captured ; or he may have done it magnanimously. The Bible is not concerned to probe the motives of Cyrus, but simply to declare the fact and to perceive the philosophy of the fact, namely, that there and then Cyrus without knowing it was playing into the hands of God.

And so the way was open for God's people to return, and to rebuild the waste places of their beloved city. But here comes a thing so sad that it broke the heart of all the best people amongst them. From this day, and because of this thing, all the further psalms of Israel are written in a minor key. It was this : the gates were open, the way home to Zion was clear, but the people themselves would not go back ! Page after page of Isaiah's prophecy is taken up with appeals to them to come back. This good man makes promises and promises in the name of God. One of the most beautiful is, 'The Lord will go before you, and the God of Israel will be your rearward.'

2. There are ideas within this promise—in which God pledges Himself to be our rearguard—ideas which we shall always need as individuals, and which the human race will always need to save it from being overwhelmed by forces which spring up out of the region of the past.

Is it not the case that our enemies spring up from behind, from the region from which we have come ? For these lives of ours are continuous, and we stand related to all that has ever happened, so that no man can promise himself that he shall not be assailed and smitten within by something

which belonged to him at an earlier stage, though he had, it may be, almost forgotten it. Here, of course, we are unveiling the whole world of moral memory, the world of regret and remorse, with its sadness or its shame according to our personal history.

For a long time now, it may be, we have thought too little of these things ; and in consequence our life and our religious life has been becoming hard and strident, lacking in humility towards God and in charitableness towards others. It is no part, indeed, of God's purpose simply to disable us or to dishearten us from going forward, by reminding us of something from the region of our past. There is forgiveness with God. But that forgiveness from God, that liberation of our spirits from those haunting shadows of regret and anger at ourselves, is to be secured by us one by one, not by denying that those intangible things are real, but, on the contrary, by accepting them as most real, and then, our pride having been crucified on the cross of memory, by lifting up our eyes to God who in Christ provides us with an answer to our accuser.

There is a couplet of Francis Thompson which seems to be compact of this beautiful and tender truth :

That my tone be
 Fresh with dewy pain alway.

That is one form which the attack takes from the region of the past, against which the love of God in Christ has laid down a great barrage. But one has not a great deal of difficulty in dealing with a moral affliction like this, where disabling things overtake us *without our consent*, we ourselves meanwhile pushing on ahead. Far away at the back of our minds we have the feeling, which Christ approves and confirms, that if we sincerely set ourselves to high behaviour in this world, it matters not how foolish we have been in the days that are past, God will help us to meet and deal with any moral indebtedness which we may have incurred.

The case is rather different when things begin to overtake and harass a man in circumstances in which the man himself has rather assisted the enemy. A rearguard might have to deal with the enemy, barring their further approach. But a rearguard might also have to deal with its own men lest they should hang back, fall out of the ranks, or traffic dishonourably with the enemy. There are desperate moments when a rearguard may have to fire upon its own men !

A man one day quite definitely and sincerely opens his heart to that whole scheme and manner

of life which are bound up with Christ. Everything fine and beautiful which had been long suppressed in his own life rises up to approve and applaud this new attitude. He knows by the new wealth of emotion, by the fulness and liveliness of his whole being, that the step he has taken is in the line of his highest welfare and destiny. But time passes—time which the ancients called death, because it slays so many beautiful things. Not knowing, as we should all get to know, that every lofty emotion needs to be encouraged and sustained; not knowing that it is the very nature of a lofty emotion to tire and droop and fade, a man one day finds old things putting in an appearance again, things which in the day of his fine decision seemed entirely abhorrent. Unless he can shake himself clear of this philandering mood, the past will surge up and engulf him. He will begin to say to himself that a man is a man (meaning really that he is not); that we must not screw ourselves up too high; that life is life, and so on. Now it will help a man if he makes clear to himself that what is happening to him is, that his past, which he in the very best moment of his life condemned and promised to himself before God to be done with—and for the sake of that pledge God sent him those waves of happiness and that feeling of clean deliverance which is still his finest memory—his past is proposing to engulf him, proposing to undo the pledges and the achievements of days or months or years, he might in that case be so startled and so ashamed that the defeat would be averted, and he would come out on the honourable side of the crisis.

Well, God has put down a barrage there, too, for the help of us men and women who in weak moments may be tempted to look back. There is a story which we all know, the story which is the basis of a great Polish work of fiction, *Quo Vadis*? in which we are told how St. Peter in Rome fled from the city in fear of persecution, and how as he was hurrying away from his post because of the danger, because of the threatened cost, hurrying breathlessly away from the life to which God had called him, retreating from the front line of the battle, St. Peter lifted up his eyes and there saw Jesus coming towards him, and making to pass him by. Whereupon the Apostle stood still and confronted his Master who would have hastened on. '*Domine, quo vadis?*'—'Lord, whither goest Thou?'—said the Apostle; to which our Lord replied, 'I go to Rome once more to die for thee!'

The religion of Christ has no necessary quarrel with those who would have it that we men and

women on our physical and material side bear traces of a very lowly origin. The Bible itself declares we are made from the dust of the earth. True, the Bible declares that it was God who made us, that the differentiating thing in us which separates us from all His creatures is that God breathed into us His own essence, His own quality. But that lowly origin, that natural basis, sends its thrusts of insinuation across our spirits from time to time. Armies belonging to the land from which we have come pursue us, as the hosts of Egypt pursued God's people. And according to our religion a man is saved, and he alone is saved, who has in his own personal life one, Christ Jesus, who has, so to speak, blocked up the passage within him which communicates with those baser elements of his nature. Christ has come into the world to cut off our retreat, our relapse, lest the experimental apostasies of man might one day go too far.

'By the bedside of each man,' says Stevenson, in a familiar passage—'By the bedside of each man stands the box of Abudah. Thank God it is locked!' Within the complicated soul of each of us lie all manner of sinister and treacherous possibilities. And it is to meet this danger, to secure us against this secret treachery and liability of our nature, that our religion would have us not suppose ourselves secure until we have Christ so enshrined in our lives that the very first tendency to retreat shall be pulled up suddenly by His withstanding countenance; so that, if in spite of everything we fall, we shall fall in shame and repentance upon His breast and, rising therefrom with that sense of revenge upon ourselves, and of haste and of indignation, which is the secret of souls of a certain quality, shall return with Him to the good light of faith.¹

Out of the depths, from cleft to cleft

Toiling upward, my couch a stone,

I thank Thee, God, I am not left

To face my soul's grim foes alone.²

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

Life's Alembic.

'In your patience ye shall win your souls.'—
Lk 21¹⁹ (R.V.).

1. It is the endeavour which crowns life—'that ye win your souls.' It is needful to say what is meant by the soul, yet there is little help in a discussion which oldest and newest thinkers alike leave much where they find it. Let us say simply that there is in man something lying deep, deeper

¹ J. A. Hutton, *Our Only Safeguard*, 2.

² Elliot Field.

than the powers and faculties which put him in touch with the material world, and which relates him to the Divine. It is not to the writings of philosophers, but to the story of struggling and achieving men and women, and especially to the lives of the saints, that we may go usefully and authoritatively to know of the soul. They will tell us of the swift annihilation or the slow out-driving of lower desires by the might of it; of its power of vision, by which it has an apprehension of God which nothing can falsify, and a sense of the spiritual world which can make men serenely indifferent to the conditions of an earthly lot. They will tell us of its power of sending through commonest words and acts, or the common clay of a mean body, the thrill of a mysterious force, felt of all; of its powers of enjoyment drawn from sources which the world cannot dry up.

There is a stream springing from the hills, beginning its pilgrimage to the ocean. The hills were not its origin, but its birthplace into earth conditions. It came first from the invisible, and thence was precipitated, soaking into the earth, to appear presently as a stream, bound within limitations, destined to work its way through all manner of obstructions until it reaches the sea, but in all its career cleansing, refreshing, beautifying. So is the soul. It is an analogy incomplete, for that stream which joins the river ceases to be itself when it returns whence it came, while the soul of man, itself part of the universal soul, loses no sense of separateness. But it is at least a symbol of the ceaseless urge of that in man which is Divine, steadily asserting itself, cutting its way through obstacles, fertilizing the earth-life through which it passes, and found in the end in the bosom of God from whom it came.

When that which drew from out the boundless deep
Turns again home.

How, then, shall we speak of this which we have, as if by long struggle it were yet to be won? We know the answer. We have always to fight for our best gifts. When they come to their own in our lives it is always a victory. Here is one with the soul of an artist, and it is the gift of God. But how shall he win his artist soul so that he possess it in freedom? Ignorance and inexperience thwart its sovereignty and, perhaps, sordid circumstances hold it down. Only by toil, sacrifice, and denial, with determination and patience, shall at last that which he *has* become that which he *is*. It has to cleave its way—no, that is too heroic a word for what is usually a long, patient, unrelenting struggle,

a resolute carry-on till antagonisms are worn down, and the artist soul is able to do the thing it sees, shape the unpromising marble into life under the touch of its inspiration, or out of common canvas and crude colours bring forth the stuff that the dreams of the spirit of beauty are made of.

So it is with this deep thing within us we call the soul. Through it we have a sense of the spiritual world, and it disturbs our material content with a Divine restlessness. But this which we have is what, in the long issue, we are meant to be. If we are content only to have it, letting it lie unheeded among the elements of life, we shall lose it. As Jesus said, 'From him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath,' and it is a dread thing to think of that the spiritual should ever find nothing in us to which it can any longer appeal. We have to fight for our souls that they may be ready, quick, practised, and dominant; sovereign over our standards of judgment, our schemes of values, our every interest, ambition, and purpose in life. 'My soul,' said Santa Teresa, 'is then so mistress of itself that it is in its kingdom, and has everything under its feet.' This is the one endeavour which crowns life. It is the one pursuit which makes life, to its last day, full of interest, and this is what life is for, and the world is for—to grow and win the soul.

2. Looking now into the chapter we see the mind of Jesus overswept by the realization of coming disasters and tribulations, and the day coming swiftly when a vast desolation should befall. He sees clearly that His own disciples will not only be involved in the wide trouble of that day, but that particular and bitter dangers will beset them, testing them to the breaking-point. It was with a mind full of such forecast that the assurance of the text came to His lips. Behold the shadowed fields of conflict upon which men win the great prize.

It is in such shadowed fields that nations win their souls. There was a day in the history of imperial Greece which transformed its character. It was the day when, amid the rejoicings of the autumn vintage, there came first a rumour, then the certainty, of disaster at Syracuse. It was an hour of disaster and ruin, but the agony of soul-conflict, affecting a whole generation, marked the transition from a meaner Athens to the Athens of Plato and Demosthenes, the Athens that could write: 'Virtue cannot be the ruin of those who possess it, nor justice the destruction of a city. The State which is founded on justice alone can stand.' There was a like time for England, when, in the fifteenth century, after the short glory

of Agincourt, humiliation followed humiliation, calamity followed calamity, shame of foreign defeat and misery of civil conflict. But it is down into that shadowed field of English history, to that epoch of tragic insight, that the historian tells you to look for the birth of those wider conceptions of justice and of freedom whose transforming force, advancing imperceptibly, often unnoticed across generations, has fashioned a new England.

In our own day a maelstrom of catastrophe broke over Europe and swept the world. Our own nation moved out into the long horror of war, and emerged to discover that the making of peace that is worth the name is harder than to make war. Disillusionment rests darkly on us, and the nation's way is now, and for long will be, perilous. We cannot help to keep the soul alive in Europe unless we are bent on winning and possessing our own soul. The nation which knows that the springs of life are in God and His righteousness, and in the knowledge disciplines itself into obedience, is a nation that is in the way of winning its soul.

This thing is true also of the individual. Face to face with the ultimate things the issues of life clear, and men see the things that matter most and matter only. It is just here that the one steady ray of light is seen falling upon the enigma of life's sufferings and failures, and especially its apparently undeserved sufferings and pain. We have seen men come out of the dark conflict, as Jacob out of his long night's struggle, halting, but with a new name, and a prince with God. It is this that helps us to believe that God has a greater end and aim for man than either his happiness or comfort, or even peace—that he should find and free the spirit that is in him, and

distil
From life's alembic
The man's essential soul.

3. Let us consider now the word of Jesus concerning the great quality which decides the issue. 'In your *patience*.' The word is really endurance. It is patience with a thread of steel running through it. Our Lord had much to say of this quality. 'It is not an entirely simple thing. It is never simply bowing to the storm. It is never merely the capacity to wait. It is the spirit of man adjusting itself, holding its reserves, handling things as they come hopefully, and at the worst, it is just going on in what light there is and with what strength we can summon. It is the bringing of wisdom and experience to bear on things and not wavering.

If our Lord said much of this He showed more of it than He said about it, and those who called Him to mind afterwards, remembered how greatly this was His own quality. When the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews wrote to men dismayed amid the very dissolutions and terrors Jesus had foretold, it was this which came to his mind. 'He *endured* such contradiction.' 'He *endured* the cross.' It is the quality of holding on, not merely in outward deed, but in the spirit and temper of the mind.

What is there in the quality of endurance which in this sphere warrants the assurance of victory? The warrant for it lies in the nature of the things of the spirit. It is the quality of the things of the spirit that they have within themselves a principle of supply and renovation, that they do not waste but for ever remake themselves. The philosopher Bergson was prompted by his consideration of the factors and conditions at the beginning of the great war to one of the few dispassioned books of that time. It was in essence a story of two kinds of energy. As the philosopher saw the beginnings of that conflict, he saw the force that is spread on the surface against the force in the depths; the energy which cannot repair its own spending and the energy with a self-creative and self-renewing power. A nation and people may blockade themselves morally by severing themselves from every ideal capable of renewing spent and failing powers. He was dealing there with more than the facts and issues of the immediate situation. He was discussing a question which involves the problem of the future of humanity; no less a question than whether humanity is increasingly to materialize and mechanize its spirit, or to progressively spiritualize its matter and machinery.

In the difference between the two energies lies the guarantee of this assurance of Jesus about the winning of the soul. The energies of the spirit do not waste in spending. In the high affairs of the soul, to hold it is to win. To spend in this struggle is to have, and ever to gain.¹

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

The Faithless Lover.

'But I have this against thee, that thou didst leave thy first love.'—Rev 2⁴ (R.V.).

For the most part the Ephesian Church is frankly commended; but in one particular it was found wanting. Whilst loyal in faith, circumspect in life, and active in evangelism, its vitality had

¹ T. Yates, *The Strategies of Grace*, 44.

declined; the glow of its early experience, the enthusiasm of its new-born service, were no more.

1. Note the *surprises* of this condition. For two obvious reasons the lack of heartiness is not what might have been expected. St. Paul knew well the Ephesian Church, for he had laboured for three years in that city, and his Epistle to that Church denotes his high opinion of its spiritual capacity. Each apostolic letter has a character of its own. The Epistle to the Romans is a vast, sombre forest in which one may easily lose one's way. That to the Galatians is a thorny jungle. In Corinthians, Philippians, and Colossians are regions of vines and fig-trees, of palms and willows. St. James presents an agricultural area of practical things, interspersed with choice flowers. Jude is volcanic. The Epistle to the Hebrews reveals a fossil forest as if by magic bursting into glorious life. St. John introduces us to green pastures and still waters. The Book of the Revelation is a tropic garden. The Epistle to the Ephesians is Alpine—a Mont Blanc, with abysses of profound thought, and whose white summits are steeped in the mysterious glory of the infinite and eternal. And its grand theme is love.

The close association of St. John with Ephesus must also be remembered. It would appear that here was the chief seat of his ministry. As the name of St. James stands for duty, and that of St. Paul for righteousness, so the name of St. John stands for love. Extraordinary men often stamp their special character on the city of their birth or residence, giving it a certain ecclesiastical, scholastic, or patriotic fame which persists for generations; and it might reasonably have been thought that the sublime individuality of the Apostle would for long have impressed itself upon the Church he administered.

Without defect of conduct we may lose that spiritual fervour which is the soul of goodness, the essence of character, the secret of sanctification, the inspiration of all faithful and beneficent life. In the sad days of his mental failure Dean Swift, happening to glance at a page of one of his own books, exclaimed: 'What an intellect I had when I wrote that!' But we must remind ourselves that there may be a spiritual as well as an intellectual eclipse.

2. The *seriousness* of it. It is not too much to say that the Church in question might with less peril have suffered in any other direction. Whilst the heart remains true the Christian character will survive many errors and aberrations, but growing cold all that is distinctive of high Christian attain-

ment and experience is bound to suffer. Botanists tell how the various plants are affected by a sinking temperature; that the convolvulus will bear one degree more of frost than the dahlia, and the canary creeper one more than the convolvulus; and that it would be possible to fill a large flower-bed with plants arranged according to their cold-resisting power, so that on each morning of late autumn and early winter we could see the intensity of the frost the night before by the plants that had suffered. It is not possible after any such fashion to determine the cold-resisting power of the several virtues and graces; some will exist longer than others in the wintry air, those with a social and financial value the longest; but it is safe to say that as the thermometer sinks every vital principle of elevated conduct is weakened, every grace of character dimmed, every rich experience of the soul impoverished. Peary tells that in the Arctic zone a few meagre flowers are found, but as far as he could make out they had no scent.

As the heart grows cold the guarantee of moral security fails, for the pressure of temptation soon becomes too severe for the lukewarm. As the heart grows cold the principle of growth ceases. In Nature nothing grows in a cold light, however brilliant it may be. A truly Christian life cannot be maintained on cold calculation, mere intellectual assent, or ecclesiastical routine and ceremony; it is born and must mature in a holy fervour. Professor Seeley's dictum is often quoted: 'No heart is pure that is not passionate; no virtue is safe that is not enthusiastic.' And long ago Balzac wrote to the same effect: 'A reasoning passion is a depraved thing. Passion is beautiful only when it is involuntary and full of those noble outbursts in which selfishness has no place.'

For naught's so sad the whole world o'er
As much love which has once been more.

3. The *signs* of it. A wide chasm stretches between the impassioned love of the saint who walks closely with God and the frigid mood of the follower at a distance; but that chasm may be crossed by a thousand fine, almost imperceptible gradations. The whole habit of religious worship and fellowship may be preserved whilst its spirit and truth have been lost.

Madame de Staël records an experience which, whilst not without its humour, may point a moral on a higher plane. A gentleman who commenced to pay her attentions often conducted her from the college to her home. On the way they had to pass through a large square, and at the beginning of

their acquaintance he took the road by the sides of the square. Then she saw that he crossed it in the middle, whence she concluded that his love had at least diminished by the difference between the diagonal and the two sides of the square.

4. The *secret* of it. Let us first remind ourselves that there is no necessity in the nature of the case that religious fervour should abate. The love of the scientist for knowledge does not wax cold. Berzelius was consoled in death by the anticipation of still being permitted to explore the mysteries of the physical universe. The love of the artist for beauty is undying. In his last hour Turner requested that he might be raised to see the sun rise. The love of the scholar for learning does not exhaust itself, for on the tomb of Green, the historian, is written: 'He died learning.' As to human affection, we will not for a moment tolerate the thought of its necessary abatement. And revelation gives no sanction to the idea of a necessary spiritual declension. True love is of the nature of the eternal, and of the eternally progressive.

Naturalists have much to say about a very remarkable plant found in the Malay Archipelago. It is a member of the highest class of the vegetable world, and at one time must have exhibited unique splendour; but it has degenerated to the level of

a fungus. From some cause or other it has become parasitic; instead of growing on its own root, living on the rain and dew of heaven, it has fastened on the roots of other trees and sucks their sap. It still bears handsome blossoms, but steadily declines from its ancient glory; already it has lost its stem and leaves, and its flower must ultimately dwindle into insignificance. We see in the Church of Ephesus a parallel degradation. Once 'rooted and grounded in love,' in the love of God and man, it attained to peerless perfection; but, striking its roots into inferior grounds and alien things, the Lord of the Church had to lament 'the fading flower of His glorious beauty.' If we had the full history of this Church for the intervening years we should know for a certainty that she surrendered to the fascinations of a rich, luxurious, dazzling city, and that here was the secret of her departed glory.

'Keeping yourselves in the love of God.' The higher, the more delicate, the more precious anything is, the more watching it demands. We must be very jealous lest secondary interests, pleasures, and ambitions divert our gaze from the supreme ideals, and so in the end leave us soulless and disinherited.¹

¹ W. L. Watkinson, *The Fairness of Trial*, 39.

Great Attacks on Christianity.

VI. R. G. Ingersoll.

BY THE REVEREND EDGAR P. DICKIE, M.C., M.A., B.D.(EDIN.), B.A.(OXON.), LOCKERBIE.

THE *Professor at the Breakfast Table* foresaw 'such a crack of old beliefs that the roar of it is heard in all the ministers' studies in Christendom.' That was written in 1859. Ingersoll was then twenty-six, and he lived and lectured for forty years after that. He was the son of a Congregational minister; became a lawyer, recognized as one of the most gifted in America; and, for a year, served as a colonel of cavalry on active service. His biographer, Edward Garstin Smith, most injudiciously brackets his name with that of Shakespeare, while a more recent and equally absurd misnomer is 'a John the Baptist of Modernism' (C. F. Potter, *The Story of Religion as told in the Lives of its Leaders*). Among his intimate friends was Henry Ward Beecher, who

once declared that he could write Ingersoll's epitaph by using the title of one of his lectures—Robert Burns. The controversies provoked by his articles and lectures captured such eminent pens as those of Gladstone and Cardinal Manning (*North American Review*, vols. 146, 147).

It is hard to believe that, barely fifty years ago, in the time of our own fathers, the authority and inspiration of Scripture could supply the opening for an attack which was regarded with so great trepidation. To many Biblical critics of the time Ingersoll must have seemed not unlike the chorus in a Greek tragedy, always a little late in catching up, but sedulous in reiterating important discoveries to the still more laggard mind of a popular audience.

In the last months of the War, a division was ordered to prepare for the capture of Mont Kemmel. When the troops were massed behind the line and everything was in readiness, there came an anticlimax. Advance parties, sent into the trenches to facilitate the relief, were astonished and exasperated to find the guns in action where they themselves had expected to take off. The enemy had not waited for the attack, and the tide of battle had already swept far to the north. Ingersoll's chief assault was directed against the Old Testament and verbal inspiration, and, in that region, the vulnerable points and the sources of weakness were already being evacuated: the guns of Biblical scholarship were attacking the real strong-points, preparatory to the capture of a position that belonged to it of right. The 'Free-Thinker' was left with a feeling of frustration. The attack made from his flank had the same objective but a different object. Its aim had been, not his, to destroy the Scriptures, but to restore them to their own impregnable basis, and that aim had been achieved.

Ingersoll constantly professes his sincerity.

'While utterly discarding all creeds; and denying the truth of all religions, there is neither in my heart nor upon my lips a sneer for the hopeful, loving, and tender souls who believe that from all this discord will result a perfect harmony; that every evil will in some mysterious way become a good, and that above and over all there is a being who, in some way, will reclaim and glorify every one of the children of men' (*The Gods*).

There is a good deal of rant and rhetoric in his style. 'Instead of arguing,' says Gladstone, 'it pelts.' (Indeed, in controversy on such themes, Verlaine's recipe for poetry might well be followed, 'Take eloquence and wring its neck.') He has many bad blunders. (One of the strangest is his constant reference to Luke as a Jew and one of the twelve disciples.) He assures his hearers that he has read the Scriptures with care, 'and I feel bound,' says Gladstone, 'to accept this assurance, but at the same time to add that if it had not been given I should, for one, not have made the discovery, but might have supposed that the author had galloped, not through, but about, the sacred Volume, much as a man lightly glances over the pages of an ordinary newspaper or novel' (a paper in *The North American Review*, reprinted in *Gleanings of Past Years*, vol. viii.). His fun might be good, but it is usually misplaced. The title of his chapter on the Flood is 'Dampness.' And he can fall as low

as this, 'Imagine the Lord God with a bone in His hand with which to start a woman, trying to make up His mind whether to make a blonde or a brunette!' (*Some Mistakes of Moses*). A natural impatience was provoked in some of his opponents, notably in the delightful Father Lambert (*Notes on Ingersoll*, 1883), who is moved to speak of 'that monumental bore of modern times, the roving lecturer—admission fifty cents,' and who thus answers two of Ingersoll's challenges:

1. Ingersoll: 'It is claimed that through woman the race has fallen, and that her loving kiss has poisoned all the springs of life.'

Comment: Fudge!

2. Ingersoll: 'What became of Lazarus?'

Comment: It is probable that he lived an honest life, and did not spend his time in asking foolish questions.

Here and there Ingersoll has a passage of real beauty and simplicity, and always (as is the case in Mr. Bertrand Russell's *A Free Man's Worship*) it is when he has looked into the depths of his own pessimism; when, through these dim cobwebs, death and eternity sit glaring.

'We know the difference between hope and knowledge: we hope for happiness here and we dream of joy hereafter, but we do not know. We cannot assert, we can only hope. We can have our dream. In the wide night our star can shine and shed its radiance on the graves of those we love. We can bend above our pallid dead and say that beyond this life there are no sighs—no tears—no breaking hearts' (*The Truth*).

When he writes of the Bible, it would be unfair to judge him by the logic of the years. Biblical criticism has gone farther than he could have dreamed, and yet has kept the precious possession which he discarded. The idea of progressive revelation has not only given us back the Old Testament as a living book, but has also crippled the most confident attacks on the fact of inspiration.

'To prove that a book is inspired,' writes Ingersoll (*About the Holy Bible*), 'you must prove the existence of God. You must also prove that this God thinks, acts, has objects, ends, and aims. This is somewhat difficult. . . .

'How can one man establish the inspiration of another? How can an inspired man prove that he is inspired? How can he know himself

that he is inspired? There is no way to prove the fact of inspiration.'

There is reason for his scepticism so long as inspiration is regarded as mechanical, verbal, infallible. And Ingersoll, willingly or not, is led so to regard it. His denial proves too much. It leads him to utterances which read strangely alongside his panegyrics on Shakespeare. 'A poem is produced by the forces of nature, and is as necessarily and naturally produced as mountains and seas' (*The Gods*). And again, so naïvely that you might think he was parodying his own argument, 'Man is a machine into which we put what we call food, and produce what we call thought. Think of that wonderful chemistry by which bread was changed into the divine tragedy of Hamlet!' (*ibid.*). Yet, in his study of the Gospels (*What Must We Do to be Saved?*), where he points to this and to that as sound and noble teaching, he is virtually admitting the presence of inspiration, not mechanized and inerrant, but self-authenticating and compelling. Criticism of Scripture cannot even be commenced without admitting degrees of—inspiration.

Ingersoll seeks a way out by pressing the claims of *Reason against Revelation*. Under this head his objections are of more permanent interest. "'Inspired" War,' "'Inspired" Polygamy,' "'Inspired" Slavery" are among the themes of *Some Mistakes of Moses*, the argument being that there can be no such thing as revelation if mistaken morality can be perpetuated in its name. The argument would be strengthened if it could show that reason, the alternative, had always been infallible. Yet the system of marriages described in the fifth book of Plato's *Republic* seems far from perfect; Aristotle can say, ὁ γὰρ δοῦλος ἐμψυχον ὄργανον, τὸ δ' ὄργανον ἄψυχος δοῦλος (*Ethics*, viii. 1161 b); and the Rationalist colonel can go to war. Nor has it been reason which has tended to correct ethical mistakes of the past. Reason alone would never lead to philanthropy, nor science alone build an orphanage. Medicine may find the cure for disease, but, alone, it will apply it to the sufferer only as an experiment. Science has added considerably to our knowledge of the universe, but it cannot interpret its meaning. The spiritual significance of the constellations is not really altered when they are removed another billion miles. The rationalist may have a comprehensive grasp of the astronomy of his day without coming any nearer to the profound astronomy of the eighth psalm.

The argument is not advanced by an apotheosis of reason. Why, it may be asked, should it be

reason rather than feeling or will? Confidence in reason as the guiding light has no more justification than a similar confidence in any other function of the mind. It rests only on a *feeling* of security. The others, it may be argued, are quite as firmly based. For a multitude of people, the sense of the presence and guidance of God rests on a foundation that is infinitely more trustworthy.

It would be difficult to find a chapter so full of naïve self-contradictions as that entitled *A Lay Sermon*.

'I want you to remember that everybody is as he *must* be. I want you to get out of your minds the old nonsense of "free moral agency"; and then you will have charity for the whole human race. When you know that they are not responsible for their dispositions any more than for their height; not responsible for their acts any more than for their dreams; when you finally understand the philosophy that everything exists as the result of an efficient cause, and that the lightest fancy that ever fluttered its painted wings in the horizon of hope was as necessarily produced as the planet that in its orbit wheels about the sun—when you understand this, I believe you will have charity for all mankind, including even yourself.'

Everything happens because it *must* happen, so we are to be charitable. How can we help ourselves? We shall be charitable if we *must* be, and no man can be blamed for being the reverse. Nor is it possible, on these terms, to condemn anything that 'revelation' has ever given. It was 'necessarily produced.' Revelation and reason have equal value, for neither can have any. Every lecture delivered by Ingersoll is produced naturally. Then so must the refutation of it be. Perhaps, then, we are reminded that there are freaks of Nature which give, not the truth, but some parody, caricature, deformity. Reason, we may be told, decides that the lecture gives the truth, and that the refutation is the freak. Then we are bound to ask, How do we know that reason's decision is not also a freak of Nature?

A smattering of philosophy would have kept him from this blunder. The reliability of reason cannot be established by reason, for that in turn would require to be authenticated. The rationalist's justification must lie in something perilously near to what he dismisses with contempt as 'feeling.' It must, in fact, be faith in the endowments of the mind. It needs a great deal of knowledge to be

an agnostic, and a great deal of faith to be a rationalist!

It will be seen that this rationalism is not only philosophically absurd. It also breaks down in practice. The circle is wide, but it is necessarily vicious. Reason, it is said, must be the final arbiter. 'Agreed.' And we shall accept only facts. 'Agreed.' We shall first discard communion with God as not being a fact. 'Why? My reason tells me that it is a fact.' Then your reason is wrong. 'But reason is my arbiter.'

And there are many other facts which will burst the bonds of a reason so circumscribed. If once goodness is allowed in, or love, or heroism, or sacrifice, the rationalist is already superseded. Reason will never make a mother love her child, nor a man give his life for another.

We are led, therefore, to consider Ingersoll's attack on *God and the Supernatural*. In *How to Reform Mankind*, he can speak of 'that divine thing called love.' But not with any logical justification. If you have said 'love,' you have said 'super-nature' and 'morality.' You have even, it might be argued, said 'God.' But the first two are sufficient in the meantime. 'Beyond nature man cannot go even in thought—above nature he cannot rise—below nature he cannot fall' (*The Gods*). The first thesis is shattered on the fact of love; the second, as we shall see, on the fact of sin.

On the doctrine of God, Ingersoll is throughout agnostic. He is concerned almost solely with the teleological argument. To his complaint, 'For me it is hard to see the plan or design in earthquakes and pestilences,' Father Lambert replies in the same style:

'This is not surprising, since you have, with commendable humility, admitted that what you know about questions like this is almost infinitely limited. Until you see or understand the design, it is inconsistent in you to condemn it. A boy stood near the railway gazing philosophically at a passing train. A burning cinder from the smoke-stack struck him in the eye. He mused on the incident in this way: "For me it is hard to see what design or plan this great corporation could have had in spending vast sums of money to throw that cinder in my eye. It is somewhat difficult to discern design or benevolence in it."'

It is once again made clear that religious truths can be established only by religious evidence. The facts of life are not enough to prove the existence of God, but, if God is once found, the sternest

of facts is not sufficient to overthrow belief in Him.

In capital letters at the head of the lecture *The Gods* is written: *An Honest God is the Noblest Work of Man*. (Ingersoll would have loved Feuerbach. What a pity that he did not read George Eliot's translation of the *Essence of Christianity*! But he was no scholar. 'Colleges,' he said, 'polish pebbles and dim diamonds.' He spoke as a diamond.) The creation of God by man, and in the image of man, runs through all his works. Von Hügel is too heavy a piece of artillery to use against an attack so faltering, but a passage from *Eternal Life* touches both this point and one other which is never far from the reader's mind (Ingersoll's consistent neglect of the evidence of the experts—the saints and the prophets). The passage may be thus summarized (pp. 240 ff.): An entire kind of life (and that held by man to be the deepest) is declared to be a sheer projection by the individual man of his mind's contents. Nevertheless, the projector is so entirely unaware of his own action that he thinks himself (the projector) to be the creation of this (his own) projection! How can we retain Plato and Leibniz, Pheidias and Michael Angelo, Homer and Shakespeare, in highest honour, as revealers of reality and truth, if Amos and Isaiah, Paul and Augustine, Francis of Assisi and Joan of Arc are to be treated as pure illusionists in precisely that which is their specific power and attestation?

It will be seen that Ingersoll has thrown away everything which might have provided him with a basis for morality. He tries to build in this fashion: Everything is right that tends to the happiness of mankind. Everything is wrong that increases the sum of human misery. If actions had no bad consequences, they would be neither good nor bad. Man did not get his knowledge of consequences of actions from God, but from experience and reason.

It is hedonism of a sort, but a very superficial sort. The 'consequences' are always outward. The inwardness of the gospel morality is not anywhere apprehended. And morality comes dangerously near, in his hands, to self-seeking.

'They tell us that the Church has built hospitals. This is not true. Men have not built hospitals because they were Christians, but because they were men. They have not built them for charity, but in self-defence. If a man comes to your door with the smallpox, you cannot let him in, you cannot kill him. As a necessity, you provide a place for him.

And you do this to protect yourself. With this Christianity has had nothing to do' (*The Truth*).

It sounds plausible, in fact, till it is shattered on the nurse who spends her life caring for the cases which have been turned from your doors.

'Below nature man cannot fall.' That is his doctrine of sin. In the ever-recurring choice of *Education or Redemption*, the rationalist should have no hesitation. Yet Ingersoll can eulogize Shakespeare for showing 'how weak the reason is when passion pleads.' History has shown the impotence of reason. 'History knows nothing of revivals of moral living apart from some new religious impulse. The motive power needed has always come through leaders who have had communion with the unseen' (Lindsay, *History of the Reformation*, i. 190). Humanism may supply teachers, but the real need is prophets. The issue is a living one to-day. In Russia we have those who have concluded that, in social betterment, God can do nothing, and have therefore taken the matter entirely into their own hands. And, again, Lippmann's *A Preface to Morals* was a best-seller in America. In speaking of it, Professor H. R. Mackintosh has recently emphasized 'the startling contrast between the brilliant descriptive work of the first part, in which he paints society as it is, and the melancholy pessimism of the second part, where he inquires concerning the remedies which merely human effort can apply.'

We have seen that one ill-concealed sign of bias is Ingersoll's silence concerning the saints. The absence of St. Paul from his pages would be phenomenal, were it not that the reason is easily discovered. To the rationalist, Paul's conversion is, of course, inexplicable. There is apparently nothing to account for this mysteriously changed life. But with Ingersoll there is another consideration. He has staked his whole case on the vulnerabilities of inspiration and the dogmatism of creeds. Yet here is the greatest of early Christians, and his Christianity is entirely independent of all theories of revelation and all formal confessions of faith. His case is one of belief, compelled by an experience of the Person of Christ. To admit such an instance is to stultify the whole argument: to ignore it is to fall into partiality and prejudice.

It is a similar dilemma which faces Ingersoll in his treatment of the life of Christ. We have an uneasy sense throughout that he is avoiding that study of the Person of Jesus which ought to have been a part of his exposition if it was to be scientific

and free from bias. His references are scanty. One of them runs thus (*What Must I Do to be Saved?*):

'Let me say here, once for all, that for the man Christ I have infinite respect. Let me say, once for all, that the place where man has died for man is holy ground. And let me say, once for all, that to that great and serene man I gladly pay the tribute of my admiration and my tears. He was a reformer in his day. He was an infidel in his time. . . . Had I lived at that time, I would have been his friend, and should he come again he will not find a better friend than I will be. . . . That is for the man. For the theological creation I have a different feeling.'

'We shall look,' says Mr. Middleton Murry, 'like men, on the man Jesus. He will stand our scrutiny. Keep we our heads as high as we can, they shall be bowed at the last.' But Ingersoll sedulously evades this scrutiny, almost as if he were aware of the strange manner in which the rôles are liable to be reversed. He is always rushing off along a side-track—to the feeding of the multitude, the miraculous birth, the Resurrection. He thinks (in spite of passages like Mt 11²⁵⁻²⁷) that Jesus never claimed to be anything more than a man, but he does not notice that, although the title 'Son of God' is not everywhere in the Gospels, there is, nevertheless, on almost every page, a 'Follow Me.' Jesus did not ask men to believe on Him because of an *ipse dixit*, but because of their own experience. They followed Him, and He led them into a world where they could not but recognize the divine landscape. All things were changed. And they knew that no one could have taken them there but One who belonged to that country.

Of discipleship finding its inevitable consequence in confession of faith, Ingersoll has no word. It is not only that he lacks the experience. It almost seems that he lacks the organ necessary for the experience. It is as if there were a room missing in the house of his soul. Had he but known it, it is not his writings that constitute the attack on Christianity. It is himself. The one really profound apologetic problem raised by his lectures is the enigma presented by a human mind created, apparently, without the 'sixth sense,' the sense of God. 'Men lose the Faith,' writes Mr. Belloc, 'as one may lose his sense of taste, or any other lesser approach to reality; but, when this calamity falls on them, never do they cease to remember with anguish the sense of perfect adjustment whereof

they have been deprived' (*Why I am a Catholic*). For Ingersoll, that regret would always be impossible.

In taking leave of him it is natural to ask what it is that Ingersoll would set in the place of that religion which he has tried to demolish. His answer is given in *What Must We Do to be Saved?*

'In the first place, I propose good fellowship, good friends all round. No matter what we believe, shake hands and let it go. . . . Good fellowship—good friends—sincere men and women—mutual forbearance, born of mutual respect. . . . I believe in the gospel of cheerfulness, the gospel of good nature, the gospel of good health. My doctrine will give us health, wealth, and happiness. That is what I want. That is what I believe in.'

We are left with the gospel of the toast-list and the after-dinner speech. With other rationalists, he speaks too often as if they alone were conscious of the problems of the world; not realizing that the little old woman who kept the faith has faced them probably more often and certainly more profoundly, and has discovered an answer which leaves their ratiocinations in the position of a schoolboyish

essay. From time to time Ingersoll seems uneasily aware (and this may account for his rhetoric) that his supposed solutions are introducing problems infinitely more insoluble, and he conveys the ever-deepening conviction that, if religion were really so empty a sham, men would long ago have found it out, without necessitating the verbiage of this treadmill of lectures.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY.—Ingersoll, *Complete Works*, 12 volumes, New York, 1900; *Lectures and Essays: A Selection*, three series in one volume (Watts & Co.; 2s. 6d.). C. T. Gorham, *Life Stories of Famous Men: Ingersoll*. (Watts & Co.; 6d.). E. G. Smith, *Life and Reminiscences of R. G. Ingersoll* (1904); *North American Review*, especially vols. 144, 145, 146, 147, 150, 151. C. F. Potter, *The Story of Religion as Told in the Lives of its Leaders* (Harrap; 1930, pp. 444-448). W. Myall, 'Ingersoll as a Reformer,' in *International Review*, vol. 12. E. W. Herndon, 'Ingersoll in "The North American Review"' in *Christian Quarterly*, vol. i. T. G. Vater, 'Ingersoll versus Christianity,' in *Universal Quarterly*, vol. 40. 'Ingersoll's Controversy with Gladstone,' in *Public Opinion*, vol. v. Introductory chapters for Van Buren Benslow's *Modern Thinkers* (1881), and for Edgar C. Beall's *The Brain and the Bible* (1882).

Beauty as Prophecy.

By HUBERT M. FOSTON, D.LIT.(LOND.), LOUGHBOROUGH.

WE are suffering from an unsettlement of ethical standards; and there is a pathetic tendency to cherish beauty as an unquestioned form of value that can still lend a grace to life when hallowed beliefs are fading. Weary of the terrible turmoil created by one-sided mechanical advance, the world of to-day seems eager for intermittent rests in its still atmosphere. Protestant churches grow more open to its contributions to worship. And variously it becomes more urgent to think clearly about the line along which æsthetics, the philosophy of beauty, touches theology.

I suppose readers of this journal will be generally agreed that all the beauty we see makes its appearance in a world that draws its origin from creative Love.¹ And if we believe this, beauty in the world

¹ I have made this a matter of deduction in full face of the problem of evil in the last chapter of *Man*

surely looks like some kind of self-utterance of that Love.

There is indeed curious analogy between them. We know that love must seek harmony, harmony of hearts, as the condition of its own fullest self-manifestation; and if we think of what we have actually enjoyed in living in harmony with other human spirits, it becomes clear that through such harmony love can, and does, reveal the delight of its own nature. And it will be agreed that beauty, too, involves harmony: harmony in the very forms of things, and in the relation of the forms to each other. It may further be agreed that through this harmony the delight hidden in the nature of beauty reveals itself to us.

Love and beauty are like, too, in influence. *and the Image of God*. See the end of the review vol. xli. p. 403 (June 1930), in this journal.

Where beauty declares itself in the world, as in a blossoming springtide, or a glowing sky, it not only quiets us with a sense of having found a resting-place that is truly ours, but also rouses us to explore its open sphere, inviting us by a delight limpid yet not to be fathomed. And in love also is an awakening rest, an unmeasured enlargement of spirit, an unsearched constraining good that becomes mystery if we try to think of it.

But turn now to art, which is the focus of beauty, and we may find ourselves looking into a region where there shines a parable, luminous but not wholly transparent, of the harmony that Love would work out wherever in the universe its purposes were fulfilled.

Look, not into a mere picture, but into a true painting—a painting which an artist's ideal, imperious with passion, has smoothed into one prevailing wholeness with itself from border to border. As you look into it and yield yourself to it, you are looking into what seems like a fragment of a world where objects, even the relatively casual, extend a peaceful and joyous harmony to others: a harmony that links them into chains that bind the total picture into one strength, and yet leave all exhilaratingly free. It is a picture of the world you know; and yet you do not find such harmony in that world. The frame shuts off the harmony that reigns within it from all interference from the jarring everyday surroundings.

Close your eyes and listen to music, and you are in a sphere of glorious revolvings, framed off from the common world by the silencing round about it of all other sounds than its own.

Dream with poetry, and you are in a realm from which all crudeness is barred, and where nothing that cannot move to rhythm with a grace or a majesty is admitted.

Now real harmony in the world is not an artistic dream, but a moral prospect; and it is not truly desirable in any other shape. For if our spirits remained unharmonized with Love's ends, and therefore unharmonized with one another, the most perfect harmony in objects and events about us in the world would be no harmony on the whole; because the world and our own inward condition would be out of harmony. As truly as music of the classical tradition is the more expressive through the presence of discords to be resolved on right methods into concord, so truly, I believe, is the world the more expressive to us, as we now are, because its very disasters keep alive our sense of tragic moral need.

But far in advance of Love's deep main work of

spiritual reconciliation and established harmony, the manifold achievements of art are present with us, reminding us in a thousand ways of possible harmony for the world; holding forth parables that may fascinate us into further fascination, and even strike us with awe by their power, while yet they leave the world about them in bondage, and have no depth comparable with that of the still unrealized harmonies of Love. And that art can do this on an immediate base of sense and imagination, and with an appeal that makes no such demand upon human nature as Love makes upon us, is a present value of art, and a present danger.

The value may be illustrated from what Jesus—quoting from Isaiah (6⁹. 10), but, I believe, with profound origination—says of a wider subject than art: 'To you is given the mystery of the kingdom of God'—this to His own, living in the secret and unexplored glory of an eternal meaning in life—'but to them that are without, all things happen (πὰ τὰντα γίνεται) in parables' (so I read it).¹ For those without, history and life are going on like a tale the inner meaning of which they do not perceive or even notice. It is as if, to men who shrink from the repentance that must come upon them with a closer revelation of God, the world is continually given like a parable, so that they may go on seeing, at any rate, even while they dare not commit themselves to understanding and its consequences. Art also can be given to those who will not seek a deeper insight than art can give them. To be seeing something so much like spiritual reality as they can see upon this relatively facile basis of sense and imagination, though it will reveal to them no personal God, may yet restrain them from crass materialism; it may perhaps keep unbarred, for a time at least, such an avenue towards their inner spirit as *might* some day open to Love's appeal.

Now as to the danger. By one who knew him² Michel Angelo is said to have declared, indeed, that 'good painting is an imitation of God's perfection.' And Sir Joshua Reynolds wrote of him: 'To kiss the hem of his (Michel Angelo's) garment, to catch the slightest of his perfections, would be a glory and a distinction enough for an ordinary man.'

¹ Mk 4¹¹⁻¹² seems simply to state a universal principle on which the procedure of Jesus is profoundly based; Mt 13¹¹⁻¹² gives the application of the principle in wisely reticent practice; while Lk 8¹⁰, in characteristic double suggestiveness, is on the line between the two.

² Francesco d'Olanda.

But after a life of such vision into the majesty of art as one dare not say has ever been surpassed in human experience, it was this same Michel Angelo who found the imitation could not satisfy him, and turned thus from the parable to the reality :

Now know I well how that fond phantasy
Which made my soul the worshipper and thrall
Of earthly art is vain. . . .

Painting nor sculpture now can lull to rest
My soul that turns to His great love on high
Whose arms to clasp us on the cross were spread.

The harmonies of art may begin to tell us by contrast what we are not, and remind us of what the world is not. But they will delude us if they ever charm us into feeling that we have come so smoothly into peace that we can dispense with a more actual harmonizing—a harmonizing that comes through a Cross encountered in no sphere of softly blending forms, but endured in the crushing agony of this world's awful contradiction of Love. And if, even in the midst of worship dedicated to God, art seems to wrap us about in a refined drawing-room atmosphere, inducing us to forget or revolt from the kitchen work that has to be done before Love can rejoice over its ideals as actually accomplished, it stultifies the aspirations it ought to awaken.

Whether, presenting us with the likeness of a far-off goal near at hand, art is enlarging or shortening our range, depends on whether or not it helps us to keep our eyes open to what is larger than itself, and includes more of our humanity. The artist himself, as a man, may not be reading the deeper meaning of the glorious parable he is moved to utter, and his human nature, capable of ennobling fellowship with God and with men in the image of God, may be shrivelling : Michel Angelo could have warned him. And all the time there are little shopkeepers in back streets, who never saw anything of Michel Angelo's or Reynolds's, but who are facing the discords in the power of the all-subduing harmonization which they find where Michel Angelo

saw it, and to whom the inner secret itself is beginning to be revealed.¹

Art did not invent beauty. It focuses rays of beauty that are diffused over a broken earth in greater grandeur, and we believe in vaster promise, than art can compass. Fulfilment of the promise diffused in beauty, and the prophecy focused in art, can only come through travail so stern that art would need to forget that it is art before it could truthfully portray it ; and the travail is stern because Love is real, and would not be real love to us if it did not at all costs maintain our moral reality.

¹ It seems worth noticing that art itself delicately oscillates between the two poles of purifying abstraction and concrete comprehension ; and I believe that it is as it inclines to the second while preserving the principle of the first that it comes towards the fullness of its thrill.

I could wish that the unversed reader who cares for a binocular through which he could see the vision of art strangely near, would steadily contemplate two good photographs (not cheap colour-prints) : one of Leonardo's ' Virgin of the Rocks ' in the Louvre, and the other of the picture attributed to him under the same title in the National Gallery. Assume that the Divine Child and the angel, at any rate, in the second, are Leonardo's drawing—Leonardo's as refining upon himself years after the precarious springtide freshness now seen in the Louvre came into being. There is abundant scope for comparison ; but dwell upon the drawing of the head of the Child, in both suggestive of a Divine wisdom incarnate in infancy. See the relatively pure general abstract beauty into which the later one is refined. Compare the circumstantial individuality of the other, and criticise the less completely idealized projection of nose from brow, and the fold of lip. Yet if your heart begins to beat over this relative everydayness as it did not when you looked at the more abstract presentation, and an awed sense of the greatness of very Nature itself, when plainly seen through an ideal, weighs upon you while you look at the earlier, and lightens when you look at the later, you will understand what I mean by the conditions of art's fuller thrill.

And that art grows richer in truth by grasping and transfiguring more of actuality may strike us as but a parable of a real harmonizing promised through One who lived deeply in the actual world, and laid hold upon it to the uttermost.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Varia.

By his book on *Faith and History in the Old Testament*, Professor D. Artur Weiser,¹ already favourably known for his penetrating study of Amos, has rendered a valuable service to modern theology, which is in danger of forgetting the importance of history for any religion which claims to be founded upon the Bible. He maintains that Old Testament faith is unintelligible without reference to the history out of which it grew. Later writers make perpetual appeal to history, notably to the Exodus, as illustrating the nature and the ways of God. The figure of the historical David influenced the expression of the Messianic hope, and the experience of the Exile helped to create the figure of the Suffering Servant. The genius of the Hebrews for the appreciation of history is best seen when contrasted with the mythological tendencies of other peoples. This is very evident in the turn given by the Hebrews to the Babylonian story of creation; it is evident also in the stories of Samson and Esther, with their mythological background. But it is no less evident in the transformation of ancient nomadic or agricultural festivals, like Passover or Booths, into festivals reminiscent of the early historical experience of Israel. Jahweh is always near, He is revealed within experience and among the facts: the mythological mountain of the gods is replaced by Mount Zion, and the river of Paradise is in Jerusalem. His will has nothing in common with the ambiguous oracles of other peoples: it is 'very nigh unto thee, in thy mouth and in thy heart,' it is revealed in the concrete demands of the Law.

Mythology implies polytheism: the superiority of the Hebrew religion lies in its conception of history as under the control of one Will—the Lord God Omnipotent reigneth in the affairs of men. The tendency to find God pre-eminently in the past was corrected by the dramatic representations of the cult, but most of all by the personal experiences of the prophets. No one who watches the movement of interpretation indicated by J, E, D, P, and the Chronicler, can deny the growth of the tendency to schematize the history, even at the expense of an occasional distortion of it, under the influence of a mechanically retributive theory of God's ways with men; but it is here that the

prophets, with their experience of God's immediate touch upon their souls, especially in the hour of their call, render their immeasurable service. There is nothing of which they are more sure than that the God who *was* is the God who *is*; in this sense they are impressionists—witness their perpetual 'Hear' and 'Behold.' But they, too, have the long perspective as well as the intimate experience of God: in modern language, they recognize equally the 'rational' and the 'irrational' element in religion. Jeremiah, immediately conscious of his call, is conscious also of his predestination in the eternal purpose of God. The 'irruption' of the Divine into human experience is entirely consistent with a 'plan purposed of old,' which pursues its way steadily through the ages. And this leads the prophets to their profound conception of sin. While they unsparingly denounce individual and social sins—for they are always in touch with concrete reality—they know that deeper than any specific sin is Sin. Piety, at its roots, is just to recognize, trust, and obey the great, unseen, pervading Presence; and sin, at its roots, is just to ignore this Presence. Weiser's whole discussion is characterized by a rare insight into the essence of Old Testament religion.

To the Breslau Studies in Historical Theology Dr. Dionys Schötz contributes a volume on *Guilt and Sin-offering in the Old Testament*,² which, besides exhaustively discussing all the references to these offerings in the Levitical legislation, Ezekiel, and elsewhere, deals suggestively with the significance of blood in the Old Testament. Blood, he points out, is not absolutely indispensable for atonement (cf. Nu 16⁴⁷), and he argues against the idea that the Old Testament regards the slain animal as a substitute for the sinner. The animal is essentially a *gift* to Deity, it does not take the sinner's place. Schötz disputes the view, commonly held, that the sin and guilt offerings were originally paid in money (2 K 12⁵⁻¹⁷) and later in kind; he is suspicious of such 'evolutionary' treatment of the history, and believes that the original offerings were in kind. The etymology of כֶּסֶף, connected as it may be with roots signifying 'to cover,' or 'to wash away,' is too uncertain to guide us to the meaning, but Schötz connects it with Accadian, where, however, it had magic implications, and

¹ *Glaube und Geschichte im Alten Testament* (Kohlhammer, Stuttgart).

² *Schuld- und Sündopfer im Alten Testament* (Verlag Müller und Seiffert, Breslau; M. 5).

claims it to be a technical expression in cultic usage for all that is involved in carrying out the rites of atonement.

Two books on *Islam* have reached us. One, by Professor Schacht,¹ consists exclusively of a selection of texts, drawn from more than sixty authors, in an excellent German translation, which illustrates the development of Sunnite Islām from its origin right up to the present day. As the Qor'ān and such other Arabic texts as have already appeared in reliable German translations are excluded, the collection here presented is not only of interest to laymen, but of value to scholars. The subjects illustrated by these excerpts are as follows: tradition, the religious law, dogmatic, mysticism, ethics, piety, reformers, and modernists. Every section is full of interest, and not least the dogmatic, with its discussion of the unity and attributes of God, anthropomorphism, miracle, and kindred topics. The modernists are indeed surprisingly modern; they exhibit Muhammadanism not as the rigid and inelastic system which it is commonly supposed to be, but as thoroughly capable of accommodating itself to modern conditions, and willingly conceding the rights of the Turkish language in the public exercises of religion. These original texts, undiluted by comment, would form an admirable basis for the objective study of Islām.

The other volume, by Dr. Erdmann Fritsch, is on *Islam and Christianity in the Middle Ages*.² It deals specifically with Muhammadan attacks upon Christian doctrine, and the detailed discussion of the careers of the various authors who engaged in these polemics, some of whom had apostatized from Judaism or Christianity and were consequently in a special position to understand the distinctive doctrines of those religions. The doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation were peculiarly distasteful to the Arabic mind, and the formulation of the objections to them is even to-day not without its interest. Other points of attack were the contradictions in the Gospels. One writer, discussing the doctrine of redemption, asks from what the Christians have been redeemed; not, surely, he answers, from sin and pain and death, for they sin, suffer, and die like other men. Much of the Muhammadan attack was inspired by ignorance, of which the Jews and Christians were not slow to

take advantage. The confusion in the Qor'ān with regard to Biblical proper names, for example, is as appalling as the exegesis of Old Testament and New Testament, which sees Muhammad in the most impossible places, is absurd. For example, במאד in Gn 17²⁰ is a cryptic allusion to Muhammad; and—more incredible, if possible, still—Muhammad is at the same time the Prince of this world (Jn 14³⁰) and the Paraclete (Jn 14^{16f.})! One writer actually replaces the latter term in Jn 16⁷ by the former. The earnestness of these discussions, however, is an eloquent proof of the vitality of both religions, and in other forms the debate continues still.

JOHN E. MCFADYEN.

Glasgow.

Among all the *Festschriften* noticed from time to time in these columns, that presented last year to Dr. Wilhelm Zoellner, General Superintendent of the Evangelical Church of Westphalia, ranks very high. It takes its title from a singularly able essay contributed by the venerable recipient—*Credo Ecclesiam*.³ The papers are scholarly, but have more than a merely academic interest. The general subject may be termed the Church in the new world-situation. The introductory chapter diagnoses the position. The Church must explain itself to the earnest outsider; but further it must explain itself to itself. That is one of the most pressing tasks which confront the Church in our times. The world has changed. Men's interests and the vital questions men ask are different from what they were some centuries ago. And the Church as a whole has not kept pace with the rapidly changing world. In consequence, not only is the outsider puzzled, church members themselves are perplexed by such questions as these: What is the Church? What is her Task? How to accomplish her Task? The volume does not aim at giving such dogmatic answers to such questions as would constitute a closed and definite 'ecclesiology.' It aims at something better, to provoke discussion of what the essayists are persuaded are the main problems so that clearer views may emerge.

The essays are arranged in three groups. In the first a number of valuable papers deal with historical topics such as 'The New Testament Doctrine of the Church,' and 'The Church in the great Protestant Confessions.' The second set deals with such subjects as 'Ecclesia Orans,' 'The Church and

¹ *Der Islām mit Ausschluss des Qor'āns* (Mohr, Tübingen; M.9.30).

² *Islām und Christentum im Mittelalter* (Verlag Müller und Seiffert, Breslau; M.8).

³ *Credo Ecclesiam*, by Hans Ehrenberg (Bertelsmann, Gütersloh; pp. xvi+415; M.18).

Society,' and includes a very interesting discussion of that most difficult problem raised long ago by Montanists and Novatianists, and specially difficult since the Reformation—'Ecclesia and Ecclesiola.' The third section embraces such topics as 'The Church and the Nations,' 'The Church and the Churches,' 'Fides qua creditur and Fides quæ creditur.'

Such an outline of contents will serve to show their variety and interest. W. D. NIVEN.

Glasgow.

How can the Sermon on the Mount, when taken seriously, be applied to our daily life so as to escape the dangers of an empty formalism on the one hand, and a cramping legalism on the other? That is the problem dealt with in Professor Runestam's new volume.¹ It can never be solved until we have related our ethical ideas to the doctrines of the Reformation faith to produce an ethic that is truly Christian. We must not imagine that love is actualized in the socio-political sphere. Love is not the gift of man to the world, but the gift of God. It is God that is love, and God that is the lover, God that alone is 'good' and the real subject of ethics. If men love, it is by permitting the love of God to flow through them to occupy the whole earth, which is their reasonable service; this they may do only in faith, which is man's response to God's love, a yielding of life that it may be the medium of God's love. From this seeming inversion of our usual ethical ideas we may set out to build a new ethics which shall be no mere series of historical evaluations, but a system answering the 'Why?' of things.

It is in the moral advance of man throughout the ages that we see most fully the demand of God's love, which is not satisfied that we should live as befits our station and circumstances, but leads us in a 'pædagogical' manner to higher levels, so making a 'radical' demand that we could not satisfy but for the grace that He showers upon us. This 'pædagogic' love has set before us the perfect example of Jesus which we may follow in a spirit of true discipleship, looking at the world through His eyes, and choosing as He chose, the one thing needful from among all that is so unessential. It is in such a discipleship, inward and intense, that the love of God and the trust-

fulness of man make possible the solution of our problem.

This is a remarkable book, not easily to be comprehended, especially by those who are not Lutherans. Luther is very much in the centre of the picture, and the author is not always concerned to go beyond Luther to ask of Christ. This being so, it is rather surprising to find that for the answer to his problem he has had to go to Max Scheler and his *materielle Wertethik*. There are many pages that will inspire the preacher eager for new light on old difficulties; there is one remarkable and important passage, for instance, where the nature of the 'actual' to which Christianity is to be applied is discussed. Is it true that human nature is compounded of bestial passions, or is there at the heart of all a principle eagerly seeking to mount upward? Professor Runestam's criticism of psychotherapy is an incitement to read his 'Psychoanalyse und Christentum' (*Stud. d. apol. Sem.*, Heft 22, 1928).

Dr. Joseph Schmid, who is a Privatdozent in the Roman Catholic faculty at München, has written a supremely able and comprehensive book in defence of the traditional origin of the Captivity Epistles.² There is a most impressive list of German, English (and Scots), American, French and Dutch works on the subject, but the author acknowledges that he has no new facts on which to work. It has therefore something of a disquieting effect, for it makes us wonder whether New Testament science must stand still until, let us say, St. Sophia gives up her treasures. We are reminded of a child's toy recently seen, named 'Mosaics' and 'made in Germany.' There were little bricks, lozenge-shaped, square and triangular, coloured green, blue, red, yellow, black and white, and with them we were assured that it was possible to build up six absolutely different mosaics—with the same bricks.

In a similar fashion Dr. Schmid and Professor Duncan set out with the same facts, and reach absolutely different conclusions. Each seems to satisfy and to persuade, and only one who has made himself an expert in the subject is fit to take exception to their conclusions—and he would probably have a third 'mosaic' or solution, differing from both.

¹ *Liebe, Glaube, Nachfolge*: Von der Anpassung der Moral an die Wirklichkeit. Von Arvid Runestam. Aus der Schwedischen von Ilse Meyer-Lüne (C. Bertelsmann, Gütersloh; vi, 186 S., 1931, M.6).

² *Zeit und Ort der Paulinischen Gefangenschaftsbriege*. Mit einem Anhang über die Datierung der Pastoralbriege (Herder, Freiburg im Breisgau; gr. 8vo, xii u. 170 S., 1931, M.8.).

The present book is a patient heaping up of argument on argument, a sober weighing of possibilities. The first chapter is destructive of the theories of those who stand for the Ephesian origin, the second seeks to outline the situation presupposed by the Epistles. Thereafter a discussion

of the relation between the Epistles of the Captivity and the rest of Paul's writings, and a final weighing up of the possibilities between Rome and Cæsarea. There is an appendix dealing with the Pastoral Letters.

JOHN MONTEITH.

Fairlie.

Contributions and Comments.

The Catholic Faith and the Industrial Order.

THAT such a book¹ has been written is evidence of five propositions: (1) The individualism which marked the piety and morals of last century has given place to a recognition of the intimate interrelation of the individual and society; (2) while other factors in social development are recognized, it is being maintained that the economic factor is one of the most (if not the most) potent in determining human conditions; (3) consequently Christian thinkers are affirming that in the interests of morality and religion the industrial order demands close and thorough scrutiny to determine how far, and in what ways, it is adversely affecting the life of men and women, and thus deserves condemnation and demands amendment; (4) such a scrutiny is convincing an increasing number that the defects are not superficial, and easily remediable, but radical, and call for reconstruction; (5) coincident with this conviction there has been such a world-wide collapse of industry and commerce as has shaken the confidence of the exponents and defenders of the economic system, and has prepared the public to consider a challenge of the system from the standpoint of ethical and theological thought. Such a challenge this volume offers.

The author is not expounding in it her own individual opinions, but is summarizing the discussions of the Anglo-Catholic Summer Schools of Sociology, 1928-30. That circumstance explains the words in the title *The Catholic Faith*, and the repeated references in the book itself to *the Catholic*. If that term is used, as it seems to be, in contrast to Protestant, a caveat may, in all kindness, be at

once entered. I do not find in the discussion any principle, motive, proposal, or obligation, mentioned that is distinctive of Catholicism in contrast to Protestantism; the standpoint of the volume is broadly Christian, and the author often writes Christian and not Catholic. 'Focused on God, acknowledging a double polarity (natural and supernatural) realized in a *communitas communitatum* sacramental in intention, is the Catholic sociology; and one other fundamental principle the school has traced in it—respect for personality' (p. 12). I am a Protestant, Nonconformist, Congregationalist, to state the worst about myself from the 'Catholic' standpoint; but while I may use different terminology at times, there is nothing in this statement that has not been the basis of my social interest and activity for half a century. The impression the book sometimes gives that the 'Catholic' claims a monopoly of interest in, and concern about, the Social Problem, and a superiority of competence in offering a solution for it is unfortunate, as it may so prejudice the Protestant reader as to obscure the great merits and the real value of the discussion of what is of vital importance for all Christians. It is a pity that a sectional standpoint should be made prominent in a book in which the treatment of the subject as a whole is by no means sectional. The situation calls for the co-operation of all Christians; and, if in *Faith and Order* they cannot yet ignore or forget their differences, they can surely do this in *Life and Work*. This is the only criticism I have to offer of a book which has won my high appreciation, and of which I now offer a warm commendation. Candour demanded that it should be made, and accords with what the *Stockholm* movement stands for—all Christians living and working together for the coming of the Kingdom of God.

An indication of the contents of the volume may be briefly given. The distinctive standpoint, if

¹ *The Catholic Faith and the Industrial Order*. By Ruth Kenyon. Introduction by Rev. R. H. Tribe (Philip Allan, 1931, pp. 196. 6s.).

such there really be, is expanded in the first chapter on 'Towards a Catholic Sociology.' The second chapter discusses the problems of individual conduct which arise in industry for the employed, the managers, and the employers—these need not be mentioned in detail, as they must be familiar to all who have given attention to the subject. The third chapter discusses the problems which arise from the Associations which are formed in industry, such as Trade Unions, Employers' Federations, etc. Here we are taken to 'fresh woods and pastures new,' as the Christian casuist has not as yet given these the same attention as to those of individual conduct. These individual and associational problems cannot find their adequate or final solution so long as the present economic system continues as it now is. This is a conclusion to which Christian moralists are in growing numbers and heightening degree being forced. Accordingly in chapter four there follows a searching scrutiny of the *Industrial World Order*. First of all it is to be observed that the problem is *world-wide*, as industry, both as regards its raw materials and the markets for its goods, cannot now be confined within the frontiers of one nation, empire, or continent, but has the whole world for its province. Secondly, it is to be noted that while for a time it might seem that industry had an *order* which did on the whole function, although with defects and injustices, it has now definitely broken down; *cosmos* has become *chaos*. The mechanical progress of industry, due to the advance of science, has resulted in over-production or under-consumption; the supply exceeds, not the human need, but the economic demand. The production has outrun the distribution of wealth; and we have poverty amid plenty. The economic failure has exposed the moral defects of the industrial order; individual profit as the motive, and general competition as the method, of industry have failed so to regulate it, as to secure that the increase of plenty shall secure the decrease of poverty. Unsatisfied need, unemployed labour, profitless capital—that is the *chaos* into which the industrial *cosmos* has lapsed. The perplexity of the orthodox economists in this situation raises the doubt whether their analysis can be accepted as scientific. Money as the means of exchange has a vital function to fulfil in the process of selling and buying, the relation of production and consumption, which seems to have gone all wrong. Accordingly the fifth chapter deals with the 'Financial World Order.' Here the discussion becomes more severely technical; and for the ordinary reader more difficult to follow.

The Christian as such cannot be committed to any one of the proposed remedies—Mr. Hobson's, of more spending and less saving; Mr. Cole's, of a managed currency; or Major Douglas's, of a Social Credit system. The Summer School seems to have been most interested in the last; but I am myself by no means convinced of the accuracy of the diagnosis, or the adequacy of the remedy for the disease. It would require more space than I can here claim to state my criticism. As the industrial order is world-wide, so the result of its breakdown is *The International Deadlock* which the sixth chapter describes. Economic and political interests are so interlocked, that economic rivalries may result in political discords. War may be the price to be paid for the maintenance of the present industrial and financial order. On economic grounds, involving political, and even more on ethical, the system may be, must be, challenged by the Christian Church. 'The duty of the Church is to encourage Christian co-operation in thought, and in action, to pray and to prophecy' (p. 189). Unhappily from this wide outlook it is an anticlimax to the narrow outlook which is the one defect of the book. 'The conversion of England will be wrought by no maimed or imperfect presentation of the Faith. But when the Catholic movement fully realizes the implications of its own teaching, then the day may come' (p. 192). As one who cares supremely for the unity of the Church, who desires and labours for the reunion of all the Christian churches, who welcomes and rejoices in the co-operation of Catholic and Protestant in seeking the solution of the social problems of the world, I do sincerely regret this one discordant note in an, in all other respects, very able and worthy book, for which all who name the name of Christ as above every other name owe a debt of gratitude to the author, and to the Anglo-Catholic Summer School, the discussions of which she reproduces.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

New College, London.

Dr. Lewis Muirhead: A Few Reminiscences.

IN jotting down some recollections of my own past, I have found myself recalling to mind certain anecdotes of the late L. A. Muirhead; I think they are of interest. Muirhead, who attended Glasgow Academy one year ahead of me, became 'Academical Club Prizeman' in immediate suc-

cession to the late Professor Paton Ker. If I am not mistaken, Ker was a dark horse; it had been expected that a clever, idle boy, belonging to a clever but too often idle family, would win easily. Muirhead's success, on the other hand, was entirely according to programme. He made his studies in theology at the Glasgow Free Church College, I myself being then at Edinburgh. While he was not exactly in the set of men at Glasgow whom I knew best, I heard a great deal about him through them.

What lives most vividly in my memory is the report of a conversation between Muirhead and Professor James Candlish, who taught 'Systematic.' It ended in Muirhead's announcing, 'Well, Professor Candlish, I think your system is rotten to the core.' I believe Candlish replied by expressing a hope that Muirhead would not judge the system—evangelical Calvinism—by the imperfect statement of it which was 'all that the Professor could achieve.' Can one think of any better answer, or one more Christian in spirit? James Candlish resembled a caricature portrait of his more distinguished father, R. S. Candlish; but, in the inner man of the heart, it was the younger Candlish who shone; and inward goodness reveals itself, when it least aims at doing so.¹

When Muirhead was 'settled' as colleague to another minister whose theology was of the traditional cast, he daringly announced in a sermon that 'men were tired of hearing about justification by faith, and God was tired of hearing about it; or, if He was not, that could only be because He was God and not man'; after which the older minister shook hands with his young colleague, observing, 'Well, sir! at least we know that you are an honest man.' But this was not the end. I remember hearing Muirhead preach at the ordination of my dearest friend, the late T. B. Kirkpatrick. The subject of the sermon was—or included—the Witness of the Apostles to Christ; and a striking section dealt with the tragic case of Judas. 'In his own way—and it is a very strange way—he who hangs upon the cross of his despair bears witness to Him who hangs upon the cross of our salvation'—

Judas could not endure to live when he saw what it was that he had done in betraying Christ. The same sermon included a startling assertion: 'God knows, there are still Pharisees enough to *kill*.' At the least, one had to conjecture some confusion here between Pharisees and Philistines.

Further, I have been told how Muirhead, when preaching in Morningside Free Church, Edinburgh, employed (in prayer) a well-known quotation from the Song of Solomon, 'the chiefest among ten thousand,' with the familiar if old-fashioned application to Jesus Christ; then paused, and added *de suo*, 'Yes, or ten millions, either.' One is far from recommending this outburst for habitual liturgical use; it is eccentrically or erratically pious; and yet the sort of eccentricity which it reveals 'Glads our eyes and warms our hearts.' You have not learned everything about a young soul when you have discovered that it is in violent recoil from the theology of the past. And, further, I should think it probable that Muirhead also had made his discoveries; and that Justification by Faith had rehabilitated itself in his eyes as something with a meaning and a glory not only for the piercing insight of the Divine mind but for the bitter need of men.

I last saw Muirhead at Bristol in 1926, when he took me to visit the Cheddar Caves. He seemed very full, that day, of the problem of the Synoptic Gospels. We were not to think that we could buy off N.T. critics by throwing the Fourth Gospel to the wolves; we must come to recognize that there were idealizing and unhistorical elements in our oldest documents. I must not, therefore, seem to leave the impression that Muirhead had simply *rangé*d himself, or passed from radicalism into reaction. With all his devotional fervour, he remained the honest and untiring critic of merely traditional forms.

I believe that Muirhead was essentially right in what he said about the Gospels. Our difficult change-over, from the old assumptions and postulates to the new data, is not half accomplished even yet. Nevertheless, I would contend that the spiritual sympathy of faith enriches us by what it reveals far more than it imperils us by what it distorts, and that a student of the Gospels who abrogates his faith, whether temporarily or permanently, is like a microscopist who plucks out his eyes in order that his mechanism may work unimpeded.

ROBERT MACKINTOSH.

Whaley Bridge.

¹ Another friend has told me about a conversation with James Candlish regarding the merits and drawbacks of Henry Drummond's sensationally successful early volume, *Natural Law in the Spiritual World*. 'But, Dr. Candlish, the book shuts us up to most dreadful Calvinism.' He had forgotten to whom he was speaking. 'Yes,' replied Candlish, 'Science does generally lead straight to Calvinism.' It was not true, but it was a smart hit back.

Was Jesus compelled?

IN the August number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES there was an article on our Lord riding into Jerusalem, with the title 'Was Jesus compelled?' In this contribution the writer asks 'whether Jesus was not forced by the multitude to declare Himself King and . . . put on the colt against His will'; and he adds that without this explanation we should be 'obliged to think that He had lowered or sacrificed His own conception of a suffering Messiah in favour of the popular idea.' No one has replied to this article, but it seems to me that even yet there should be some response, for the assumption on which the article proceeds is quite unnecessary. There is no difficulty in the incident, if we accept the late E. A. Abbott's explanation in *The Son of Man* that the riding into Jerusalem was a deliberately acted symbolic parable, like many such in the Old Testament.

The streets were thronged with excited fanatical pilgrim crowds, every man at heart a rebel, and Jesus was a possible leader: what might they not do before He could persuade them that He was not the sort of leader who would inveigle them into treason, bloodshed, and doom? The hearing of the ear would be ineffective when they should rush in their noisy thousands to make Him their King. But what the ear could not do, the eye could take in at a glance, and they would realize that if He came as a king He was no leader of rebellions, for He came not on the trampling war-horse, or in the state chariot, but riding upon the humblest and commonest of beasts of burden.

Further, the minute instructions given by Jesus to His disciples as to the procuring of the ass probably show that He had another important purpose in view for which He had possibly made prior arrangements, namely, the fulfilment of Zec 9⁹: 'Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem: behold thy king cometh unto thee: he is just, and having salvation; lowly, and riding upon an ass, upon a colt the foal of a she-ass.' We may be sure that He would do this out of no mere play-acting, nor any mere attempt to square the prophets; but rather because He wanted to carry out the meaning of Zechariah in His kingly claim, and because He was sure that every well-instructed Jew would at once recognize the reference to Zechariah.

On this view three things are implied:

- (1) He who enters is a King.
- (2) His yoke is righteousness and salvation.

(3) He is a meek King, not a brutal warrior or proud conqueror.

JAMES MEIKLE.

Alth.

'My life shall be to thee for a prey.'

ON reading Jeremiah recently I was struck by the phrase which occurs four times (21⁹ 38² 39¹⁸ 45⁵), 'My life shall be to thee for a prey,' for its similarity to the expression used by St. Paul of our Lord in Ph 2⁹—'counted it not a prize.' In Jeremiah the Hebrew is *shalal*; the LXX in 21⁹ gives σκῦλα=prey; elsewhere it has εὕρημα=treasure-trove. St. Paul's word is ἀρπαγμα=a thing grabbed, and this is closely similar both to *shalal* and σκῦλα. The phrase may have been a colloquialism or an unconscious echo of Jeremiah by St. Paul; in any case it is an interesting parallel.

S. P. T. PRIDEAUX.

S. Boniface

Missionary College, Warminster.

The Re-emergence of an Akko.

THE lack of logical thought-sequence in Job 5³ has led to a number of scarcely satisfactory emendations, particularly in the second part of the verse.¹ None may be said to bring out, with the least possible tampering with the text, the required antithetic parallelism, viz. (a) the flourishing fool, (b) the sudden ruin that overtakes him.

I suggest that the original text read, not יִאָקֹב וְיִנְהוּ, but יִאָקֹב בְּנֵיהוּ, and that what the writer meant to convey is that the habitation of the fool (or wicked) suddenly became the haunt of wild beasts.²

JUDAH J. SLOTKI.

Manchester.

¹ See, for a lengthy discussion, Driver, *Job*, in 'I.C.C.'
² After careful investigation I have come to the conclusion that the *akko* must have been some kind of animal that frequented waste places. It is commonly connected with the בַּר; cf., e.g., Hastings, *Dictionary of the Bible*, sub. *voc.*